

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. XIX.—No. 76.

OCTOBER, 1943

## THE TAMING OF A SHREW AND THE TAMING OF THE SHREW

BY G. I. DUTHIE

The relationship between *The Taming of a Shrew*, first published in the quarto of 1594, and *The Taming of the Shrew*, first published in the Shakespearean folio of 1623, remains an unsettled problem. Three hypotheses have been advanced: (i) that *A Shrew* is one of the sources of *The Shrew*, (ii) that *A Shrew* is founded upon *The Shrew*, and (iii) that *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* are independently based on a common source, a lost *Shrew* play. The first of these hypotheses was for long the general view, and it still has the support of eminent authorities, among them F. S. Boas,<sup>1</sup> R. Warwick Bond,<sup>2</sup> and E. K. Chambers.<sup>3</sup> The adherents of the second include Wilhelm Creizenach,<sup>4</sup> J. S. Smart,<sup>5</sup> Peter Alexander,<sup>6</sup> J. Dover Wilson,<sup>7</sup> and B. A. P. Van Dam.<sup>8</sup> The third view was held by Bernhard ten Brink:<sup>9</sup> it is regarded as a possible alternative to (i) by A. H. Tolman,<sup>10</sup> who rejects (ii), and as a possible alternative to (ii) by Hardin Craig,<sup>11</sup> who rejects (i). Samuel Hickson,<sup>12</sup> while arguing strongly for the dependence of

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespeare and his Predecessors* (1896), pp. 172 ff.; *The Taming of a Shrew*, Shakespeare Classics (1908), introduction.

<sup>2</sup> *The Taming of the Shrew*, Arden ed. (1904, 1929), introduction.

<sup>3</sup> *William Shakespeare* (1930), vol. I, pp. 322-8.

<sup>4</sup> *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, vol. IV (1909), pp. 686-98.

<sup>5</sup> *Shakespeare, Truth and Tradition* (1928), pp. 201-5.

<sup>6</sup> *Times Literary Supplement*, 1926, p. 614 (16 Sept.); *Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III'* (1929), pp. 69 ff.; *Shakespeare's Life and Art* (1939), pp. 69-71.

<sup>7</sup> *The Taming of the Shrew*, New Shakespeare ed. (1928), pp. 104 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *English Studies* (Amsterdam), vol. X (1928), pp. 97 ff.

<sup>9</sup> *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, vol. XIII (1878), p. 94.

<sup>10</sup> *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. V (1890), pp. 203-4, 227-9.

<sup>11</sup> *Shakespeare* (1935), pp. 296-7.

<sup>12</sup> *Notes and Queries*, 1st series, vol. I (1849-50), pp. 194, 226-7, 345-7.

*A Shrew* upon *The Shrew*, had allowed that *The Shrew* might possibly have been not entirely in its final state.

## I

The foundation of the case presented by upholders of the second hypothesis was laid by Hickson, who listed<sup>1</sup> from the two texts certain passages as regards which, he claimed, 'the purpose, and sometimes even the meaning' is fully intelligible only in *The Shrew*; the writer of *A Shrew*, attempting from memory to reproduce these passages as found in *The Shrew*, failed according to this theory to grasp the real significance of the words, and reproduced the passages inadequately, missing the point. Not all of the parallels cited by Hickson may be considered to necessitate his conclusion, but in my opinion some of them indisputably do. For example, in *The Shrew*, at IV. iii. 69-72,<sup>2</sup> we have:

- Kate.* Ile haue no bigger, this doth fit the time,  
And Gentlewomen weare such caps as these.  
*Pet.* When you are gentle, you shall haue one too,  
And not till then.

Compare, in *A Shrew* sig. D4<sup>v</sup>:

- For I wil home againe vnto my fathers house.  
*Feran.* I; when you'r meeke and gentel but not  
Before, . . .

As Hickson says, 'Katherine's use of the term "gentlewoman" [*The Shrew*] suggests here Petruchio's "gentle". In the other play the reply is evidently imitated, but with the absence of the suggestive cue'.<sup>3</sup>

Since the fumbling reproduction of a witticism without the point is a characteristic of texts pirated by memorial reconstruction, Hickson's evidence suggests the view that, at any rate in certain passages, *A Shrew* may represent an attempt at memorial reconstruction of the text of *The Shrew* or a text closely resembling it. I find corroboration of this in the passage in *A Shrew* which corresponds to *The Shrew* IV. i. 178-201. In certain sixteenth- and seventeenth-century pirated dramatic texts we find passages in which a memorial reconstructor, remembering the thought but forgetting most of the phrasing of his original, produces blank verse of his own, arranging in new combinations the words which he does recollect from the original, and eking out these recollections with his invention and

<sup>1</sup> *Notes and Queries*, 1st series, vol. I (1849-50), pp. 345-7.

<sup>2</sup> My quotations from *The Shrew* are from the first folio, with the numberings from the New Shakespeare ed. of the play. My quotations from *A Shrew* are from the second quarto (1596), with references to the signatures of that edition.

<sup>3</sup> For Hickson's other parallels see *The Shrew* II. i. 172-3, *A Shrew* sig. F1; *The Shrew* IV. iii. 123-6, *A Shrew* sig. E2<sup>v</sup>; *The Shrew* IV. iii. 133-5, *A Shrew* sig. E2<sup>v</sup>; *The Shrew* IV. iii. 167-72, *A Shrew* sig. E2<sup>v</sup>-E3; *The Shrew* V. ii. 176-9, *A Shrew* sig. G1<sup>v</sup>; *The Shrew* V. ii. 184-5, *A Shrew* sig. G2.

sometimes with reminiscences of passages in other plays. This type of composition is to be found in the 'bad' quarto texts of *Romeo and Juliet*<sup>1</sup> and *Hamlet*.<sup>2</sup> It can be shown that this passage in *A Shrew* was composed in the same way. It runs:

(*Ferando*.) This humor must I hold me to a while, 1  
 To bridle and hold backe my headstrong wife,  
 With curbes of hunger, ease, and want of sleepe,  
 Nor sleepe, nor meat shal she inioy to night,  
 Ile mew her vp as men do mew their hawkes, 5  
 And make hir gently come vnto the lure,  
 Were she as stubborne or as ful of strength  
 As were the *Thracian* horse *Alcides* tamde,  
 That King *Egeus* fed with flesh of men,  
 Yet would I pul her downe and make hir come 10  
 As hungry hawkes do fly vnto their lure.

The standard of the writing here is certainly not above that of the patchwork blank verse passages manufactured by the reporters of the 'bad' texts of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, and in certain respects it reminds us of these. There is defective sense in line 3, since it is not 'ease' but the reverse which is to be used as a 'curb'. Lines 5-6 and 10-11 contain repetition. Lines 7-9 contain garbled borrowing from 2 *Tamburlaine* IV. iii. 12 ff. And in lines 5-11 the metaphors from the subduing of horses and of hawks are badly mixed, whereas in *The Shrew* IV. i. 180-6 the metaphor from falconry is developed consistently.

This soliloquy in *A Shrew* conveys the general sense of that in *The Shrew* and contains some verbal parallels with the latter. 'The lure' in line 6, and 'their lure' in line 11, of the speech in *A Shrew* parallel 'her lure' in *The Shrew* IV. i. 182. Line 4 of the speech in *A Shrew* is vaguely parallel to *The Shrew* IV. i. 187-8:

She eate no meate to day, nor none shall eate.

Last night she slept not, nor to night she shall not: . . .

Again, if we compare lines 1-3 of the speech in *A Shrew* with *The Shrew* IV. i. 198-9 we find that four of the principal words in both are the same, arranged differently; the lines in *The Shrew* run:

This is a way to kil a Wife with kindnesse,

And thus Ile curbe her mad and headstrong humor: . . .

'Wife', 'curb', 'headstrong', and 'humour' occur in both. This makes it clear that there is an intimate connexion between the two versions. Can we say which was written first? I believe that the condition of the soliloquy

<sup>1</sup> See H. R. Hoppe, *Review of English Studies*, vol. XIV (1938), pp. 271 ff. The passages dealt with are in II. vi. and IV. v. Even more striking evidence of this type of composition is furnished by the passage in Q1 V. iii. which begins 'I am the greatest . . .' and ends ' . . . rigor of the Law'.

<sup>2</sup> See my 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet' (1941), chap. IV.

in *A Shrew* can be most reasonably explained by the assumption that its writer had the version of *The Shrew* in mind. He remembered that that version contained a metaphor drawn from the taming of hawks, and he recollected four of the principal words in IV. i. 198-9. He used these in his own order, changing 'curb' from a verb to a noun and altering the application of 'humour' from Petruchio-Ferando to Kate. In *The Shrew* the word 'curb' (IV. i. 199) occurs in a passage apart from that conveying the metaphor from falconry (IV. i. 180-6) and so does not conflict with it. The writer of *A Shrew*, in my opinion, caught up not only the word but also the image which ultimately underlies it. He used 'curb' itself, but as a noun; and, the word having suggested to his mind the picture of a horse, the verb becomes 'to bridle': thus he is all ready to imagine Kate as a horse which must be broken in, and he confuses this idea with that of the taming of a hawk derived from *The Shrew* IV. i. 180-6.

The fact that the writer of *A Shrew* was thus led to the idea of the subduing of horses might of itself have been sufficient to bring to his mind the passage from Marlowe from which he borrows in lines 7-9. But there is a verbal association between the relevant passages in *The Shrew* and 2 *Tamburlaine*. The writer of *A Shrew* caught up the word 'headstrong' from *The Shrew* IV. i. 199. Now 'headstrong' is the epithet applied by Marlowe to the horses of Egeus:

The headstrong Iades of *Thrace*, *Alcides* tam'd  
That King *Egeus* fed with humane flesh  
And made so wanton that they knew their strengths  
Were not subdew'd with valour more divine,  
Than you by this unconquered arme of mine.

(2 *Tamburlaine*, IV. iii. 12-16)

And so, influenced by this association, the writer of *A Shrew* drew on this passage of Marlowe referring to the taming of horses.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the word 'headstrong' does not itself occur in lines 7-9 of the soliloquy in *A Shrew* does not invalidate this view. I believe that the case here is similar to a case in the 'bad' quarto text of *Hamlet*. At I. iii. 126-31 in the authentic *Hamlet* Polonius thus warns his daughter against the hero:

in fewe *Ophelia*,  
Doe not belieue his vowes, for they are brokers  
Not of that die which their inuestments shoue  
But meere implorators of vnholly suites  
Breathing like sanctified and pious bonds  
The better to beguile: . . .

Hamlet's vows are also mentioned earlier in the scene, in lines 114 and 117.

<sup>1</sup> If he remembered that Hercules is referred to as Alcides in *The Shrew* I. ii. 254 he would be all the more likely to call the passage from Marlowe to mind.



In the 'bad' quarto text, at the point corresponding to the above passage, Corambis says:

Come in *Ofelia*, such men often proue,  
"Great in their wordes, but little in their loue.

(iii. 69-70)

Within the dozen lines preceding this Hamlet's vows are twice mentioned. Now the couplet just quoted from the 'bad' quarto contains a borrowing from *Twelfth Night*: at II. iv. 116-8 Viola says:

We men may say more, sweare more, but indeed  
Our shewes are more then will: for still we proue  
Much in our vowes, but little in our loue.

As R. Crompton Rhodes<sup>1</sup> points out, between these passages in the genuine *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* there is a verbal link in the word 'vows' which occurs in both; there is another in 'show' (verb) and 'shows' (noun). One or both of these links have carried the reporter's mind from *Hamlet* to *Twelfth Night*, so that he has borrowed from the latter in his version of the former. But the word 'vows' in *Twelfth Night* II. iv. 118 has been changed to 'words' in the reported *Hamlet* iii. 70, and the reporter does not use 'show' or 'shows' at all in this passage. That is to say, both verbal links have disappeared from the borrowed passage, though one of them occurs a little earlier in the memorially reconstructed text. Similarly, in the speech in *A Shrew* which we are studying, the verbal link 'headstrong' has disappeared from the passage borrowed from Marlowe, though it occurs a little earlier.

In line 5 of the soliloquy in *A Shrew* Ferando says 'Ile mew her vp as men do mew their hawkes'. In structure this resembles a line in the corresponding soliloquy in *The Shrew*, viz. '... to watch her, as we watch these Kites' (IV. i. 185). The writer of *A Shrew* in my view remembered the structure of this line, but not the wording. He did remember something, however, of wording which is applied to Bianca earlier in *The Shrew*, in which at I. i. 182 we have 'And therefore has he closely meu'd her vp'. And he combined the main structure of one line of *The Shrew* with wording derived from another. In thus importing the idea of the mewing up of hawks into this soliloquy he introduces a technical error. In his *Diary of Master William Silence* (1907), p. 325, D. H. Madden notes that 'hawks are mewed up for moulting and not to teach them to come to the lure. It is in the manning of the haggard falcon, by watching and by hunger, and not in her mewing or in her training to the lure, that Shakespeare saw a true analogue to the taming of the shrew'. Madden, holding that *A Shrew* is Shakespeare's source, considers that Shakespeare borrowed 'from the old writer an excellent idea badly worked out'. But it is at least equally, if

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespeare's First Folio* (1923), p. 80.

not indeed more, probable that a memorial reconstructor bungled an accurate original.<sup>1</sup>

The phrase 'want of sleepe' in line 3 of the speech in *A Shrew* does not occur in the soliloquy in *The Shrew*, and I believe that it is derived from another speech in the latter play, viz. Kate's complaint at IV. iii. 2 ff. dealing with the treatment which Petruchio-Ferando describes in the soliloquy. In IV. iii. 9 we have the phrase 'lacke of sleepe' and two lines further on the word 'wants': from these an imperfect memory might form the phrase 'want of sleepe'.

This soliloquy in *A Shrew*, then, has the following characteristics. Its thought is substantially the same as that of the corresponding speech in *The Shrew*; it contains some words in common with the latter, but arranged in different combinations; it contains some phrasing found at other points in *The Shrew*; it contains a line parallel in structure to one line in *The Shrew* and in wording to another; it contains plagiarism, with garbling, from a play other than *The Shrew*; it shows defective sense, mixed metaphor, tautology, and technical inaccuracy; and it is written in regular but flat and unpoetical blank verse. In sum, it has all the characteristics of the blank verse in the 'bad' quarto of *Hamlet*, peculiar to that among the *Hamlet* texts, which I have shown to be the work of the memorial reconstructor of that play. I cannot see how this soliloquy in *A Shrew* can be regarded as other than the work of memory aided by invention, the corresponding passage, and certain other passages, in *The Shrew* having been in existence when it was composed.

Another passage which might be cited as depending on *The Shrew* occurs in the course of the first interview between Ferando and Kate (in the scene corresponding to *The Shrew* II. i. 182-317) where Ferando says:

My mind sweet *Kate* doth say I am the man,  
Must wed, and bed, and marrie bonnie *Kate*.

(sig. B<sub>3</sub>)

The wording of these lines does not run parallel to that of any single passage in *The Shrew*. On the contrary they seem to be composed of fragments of text brought together from various scattered passages in the latter. In *The Shrew* I. i. 141 ff. Gremio says:

would I had giuen him the best horse in *Padua* to begin his woing that would thoroughly woe her, wed her, and bed her, and ridde the house of her.

<sup>1</sup> It must be noted that the line in *A Shrew* discussed in the foregoing paragraph is almost identical with a line in *Wily Beguiled*. It does not follow that the writer of *A Shrew* borrowed it from there: see Van Dam, op. cit. p. 100, where it is pointed out that there is plagiarism in *Wily Beguiled* itself. The author of the latter may have borrowed it from *A Shrew*. But even if it were the other way about my main argument would be unaffected: I should suppose that the author of *A Shrew*, remembering from *The Shrew* the structure of IV. i. 185 and possibly also the wording of I. i. 182, was led, by a natural association, to the line in question in *Wily Beguiled*, which he thereupon borrowed.

Petruchio uses the words 'bonny Kate' at II. i. 186 and III. ii. 225. As for the construction 'I am the man must . . .', in the corresponding scene Petruchio says:

Thou must be married to no man but me,  
For I am he am borne to tame you *Kate*, . . .

(II. i. 268-9)

The writer of our two lines in *A Shrew* seems to me to have mixed the thought of this with the construction of I. ii. 261-2, where Tranio says to Petruchio:

If it be so sir, that you are the man  
Must steed vs all, and me amongst the rest: . . .

It appears to me very much more probable that a memorial reconstructor combined various fragments which he happened to remember from different points in *The Shrew* than that Shakespeare separated out commonplace words and phrases from two contiguous lines in a source play and re-distributed them at wide intervals in a re-working.

There are other cases in point. In *A Shrew*, sig. B<sub>3</sub>, Kate says of Ferando 'the woodcocke wants his taile'. 'Taile' occurs in the corresponding part of *The Shrew*, at II. i. 214; and at I. ii. 158 Grumio refers to Gremio as 'this Woodcocke'.

In *A Shrew*, sig. B<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup>, Alfonso (equivalent to Baptista) says:  
come *Kate*, why dost thou looke

So sad, be merry wench, . . .

This seems to combine reminiscences of three passages in *The Shrew*—II. i. 226 'Nay come *Kate*, come: you must not looke so sowre' (spoken by Petruchio), II. i. 142 'How now my friend, why dost thou looke so pale?' (spoken by Baptista to Hortensio), and IV. i. 139 'Be merrie *Kate*' (spoken by Petruchio).

In *A Shrew*, sig. D<sub>3</sub>, there occurs this passage:

Wheres that villaine that I sent before.

*San.* Now, *adsum*, sir.

*Feran.* Come hither you villaine ile cut your nose,

You Rogue: helpe me off with my bootes: wilt please

you to lay the cloth? souns the villaine

Hurts my foote? pul easily I say; yet againe.

This contains parallels with the following phrases in the corresponding scene in *The Shrew*:

Where is the foolish knaue I sent before?

*Gru.* Heere sir, . . .

(*Pet.*) Off with my boots, you rogues: you villaines, when?

Out you rogue, you plucke my foote awrie, . . .

(IV. i. 116-7, 134, 137)

But there is also a parallel with *The Shrew* V. i. 127, where Vincentio says, 'Ile slit the villaines nose . . . '.

In *A Shrew*, sig. E2, we have the following:

*Feran.* O monstrous: why it becomes thee not,  
Let me see it *Kate*: here sirha take it hence,  
This cap is out of fashion quite.

*Kate.* The fashion is good inough: belike you  
Meane to make a foole of me.

*Feran.* Why true he meanes to make a foole of thee,  
To haue thee put on such a curtald cap,  
Sirha be gone with it.

There are parallels here with the following phrases in the corresponding scene in *The Shrew* (IV. iii.): (*Petruchio.*) Away with it (68); it is [a] paltrie cap (81); come Tailor let vs see't (86): (*Kate.*) Belike you meane to make a puppet of me. / *Pet.* Why true, he meanes to make a puppet of thee (103-4):<sup>1</sup> *Pet.* Oh monstrous arrogance (108); Go take it hence, be gone (163).<sup>2</sup> And *A Shrew* in the above passage also parallels *The Shrew* V. ii. 121, where Petruchio says, 'Katerine, that Cap of yours becomes you not'.

In *A Shrew*, sig. E3, Ferando says to Kate:

Nothing but crossing of me stil,  
Ile haue you say as I do ere you go.

This corresponds to *The Shrew* IV. iii. 190-3:

Looke what I speake, or do, or thinke to doe,  
You are still crossing it, sirs let't alone,  
I will not goe to day, and ere I doe,  
It shall be what a clock I say it is.

In my view, the writer of *A Shrew* is also indebted to *The Shrew* IV. v. 10-11:

Euermore crost and crost, nothing but crost.  
*Hort.* Say as he saies, or we shall neuer goe.

In *A Shrew*, sig. E4 and E4<sup>v</sup>, we have:

*Feran.* Come *Kate* the moone shines cleere to night methinkes.

*Kate.* The moone? why husband you are deceiud,  
It is the sun.

This corresponds to *The Shrew* IV. v. 2-3:

Good Lord how bright and goodly shines the Moone.

*Kate.* The Moone, the Sunne: it is not Moonelight now.

(Cf. also IV. v. 5: 'I know it is the Sunne . . . ') But *A Shrew*, in my

<sup>1</sup> By using 'foole' and not 'puppet' *A Shrew* misses a pun.

<sup>2</sup> Some of these phrases from *The Shrew* come from the episode involving the haberdasher, others from that involving the tailor.

opinion, combines reminiscence of this with reminiscence of *The Shrew* IV. iii. 115-6:

I tell thee I, that thou hast marr'd her gowne.

*Tail.* Your worship is deceiu'd, . . .

Finally, in *A Shrew*, sig. F4<sup>v</sup>, Ferando exclaims 'Oh monstrous intollerable presumption'. This corresponds to *The Shrew* V. ii. 93-4: 'Oh vilde, intollerable, not to be indur'd'. But it also contains a parallel with *The Shrew* IV. iii. 108: 'Oh monstrous arrogance'.

As regards the above comparisons between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* I can only reiterate that I cannot conceive of Shakespeare re-working an old play by repeatedly breaking up a passage of the latter and scattering its component words and phrases, generally commonplace, at great intervals in his revised version. On the other hand it is well known that memorial reconstructors very frequently combine in a single passage reminiscences of widely separated passages in their original.

A full comparison of the two *Shrew* texts reveals a considerable number of verbal contacts and parallel phrases in certain scenes. Such contacts and parallels occur, with greater or less frequency, in the following passages of *The Shrew* and the corresponding passages of *A Shrew*: Induction, scenes i and ii; II. i. 182-317; IV. i. 109-68; IV. iii.; IV. v. 1-26; V. ii. 66-end. I cannot see how anyone comparing these passages in the two plays can fail to conclude that there at least *A Shrew* depends upon *The Shrew* or upon a text very close indeed to that of *The Shrew*. In order to show how closely the two texts can approximate to each other I quote the parallel versions of one short passage:

*A Shrew**The Shrew*

*Feran.* Go I say and take it vp for your *Pet.* Go take it vp vnto thy masters vse.  
masters vse.

*San.* Souns: villaine not for thy life *Gru.* Villaine, not for thy life: Take vp  
touch it not, my Mistresse gowne for thy masters  
Souns, take vp my mistris gowne to vse.  
his  
Maisters vse?

*Feran.* Wel sir: whata your conceit of *Pet.* Why sir, what's your conceit in  
it?

*San.* I haue a deeper conceit in it then *Gru.* Oh sir, the conceit is deeper then  
you think for:  
Thinke for, take vp my mistris Take vp my Mistris gowne to his  
gowne masters vse.  
To his masters vse? Oh fie, fie, fie.

*Feran.* Tailor come hither: for this *Pet.* *Hortensio*, say thou wilt see the  
time take it Tailor paide:

Hence againe, and ile content thee Go take it hence, be gone, and say no  
for thy paines. more.

(sig. E2<sup>v</sup>)

(IV. iii. 155-63)

Other passages could be quoted, closely similar in the two texts; but it is noticeable that practically all the verbal parallelism is to be found in the Sly material and in the main plot. There is almost none in the sub-plot; and this brings us to the next stage of our inquiry.

## II

Whereas in the main plot there are no radical differences between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* as regards incidents and situations, there is a radical difference in the sub-plot. In *A Shrew* Kate has two sisters, wooed respectively by the characters corresponding to Hortensio and Lucentio: in *The Shrew* she has only one sister, for whose hand Hortensio and Lucentio are rivals. I find it easier, all things considered, to account for this difference by supposing that in this respect *A Shrew* represents a version of the story anterior to that given in *The Shrew* than by supposing that here it embodies a modification of the latter.

In the sub-plot of *The Shrew* there are certain inconsistencies to some of which attention was drawn by P. A. Daniel in his *Time-Analysis of the Plots of Shakspeare's Plays*.<sup>1</sup> Let us in the first place consider III. ii. 1-125. During this episode, as Daniel points out,<sup>2</sup> Tranio (posing as Lucentio) evinces an intimacy with Petruchio which is totally inappropriate in him but which would be quite appropriate in Hortensio. The bridal party is being kept waiting by Petruchio's non-arrival, and Tranio attempts to calm Kate and Baptista:

Patience good *Katherine* and *Baptista* too,  
Vpon my life *Petruchio* meanes but well,  
What euer fortune staves him from his word,  
Though he be blunt, I know him passing wise,  
Though he be merry, yet withall he's honest.

(III. ii. 21-5)

These words suggest for Tranio and Petruchio an acquaintance of much longer standing than is the case—for in fact they met for the first time in I. ii. Thus the speech is inconsistent in Tranio's mouth: but it would be perfectly consistent in that of Hortensio, who is an old friend of Petruchio's (see I. ii. 21). Again, the company having had from Biondello a description of the remarkable attire in which Petruchio is approaching, Tranio comments:

'Tis some od humor pricks him to this fashion,  
Yet oftentimes he goes but meane apparel'd.

(III. ii. 70-1)

These seem to be the words of one speaking from experience. Tranio can have no first-hand knowledge of this habit of Petruchio's, but Hortensio

<sup>1</sup> *The New Shakspeare Society's Transactions*, 1877-9, Part II.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.



would have such knowledge. Then, when Petruchio arrives, Tranio reproaches him for his absurd clothing in terms which seem to imply a close friendship between them. He tells Petruchio that he comes

Not so well apparell'd (/) as I wish you were  
(III. ii. 87-8)

and pleads with him:

See not your Bride in these vnreuerent robes,  
Goe to my chamber, put on clothes of mine.  
(Ibid. 110-11)

Daniel is surely right in declaring that 'the fact is, all these speeches of Tranio, of and to Petruchio, should be in the mouth of Hortensio, who is really Petruchio's familiar'.<sup>1</sup> Daniel also notes<sup>2</sup> that in *A Shrew* the corresponding speeches are given to Polidor, who is the equivalent of Hortensio. While the assembled company is waiting for Ferando, Polidor says:

I warrant you heele not be long away.  
(Sig. C<sub>3</sub>)

And then he conjectures an excuse on behalf of his friend:

His Taylor it may be hath bin too slacke  
In his apparel which he meanes to weare, . . .  
(Sig. C<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup>)

When Ferando has arrived and suggests that they repair to the church Polidor says:

Fie *Ferando*, not thus attired for shame,  
Come to my chamber and there sute thy selfe  
Of twenty sutes that *I* did neuer were.  
(Sig. C<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup>-C<sub>4</sub>)

With this last compare *The Shrew* III. ii. 110-11. This is admittedly the only direct parallel; but the significant fact is that in *A Shrew*, before Ferando's arrival, Polidor (*i.e.* Hortensio) tries to excuse him and to propitiate Kate's father, and after Ferando's arrival reproaches him for his mad attire and begs him to change it: in *The Shrew* all this is done by Tranio, in words suitable not to him but to Hortensio.

Dover Wilson suspects that *The Shrew* is a revision of an earlier play not extant.<sup>3</sup> This assumption affords in my opinion the most convincing explanation of the peculiarity in III. ii. just described. It would seem that in the postulated earlier play the speeches corresponding to those of Tranio in III. ii. to which we have referred were assigned to Hortensio, to whom their content is admirably suited, and that in the revision Tranio was substituted as the speaker, though the material was not properly

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 165.

<sup>3</sup> *The Taming of the Shrew*, New Shakespeare ed., p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

accommodated to his different relationship with Petruchio. In this respect, then, *A Shrew* preserves the arrangement of the earlier play, though from what was said in Section I it is clear that *A Shrew* cannot as it stands be identified with the earlier play.

A reason can be suggested for the substitution of Tranio for Hortensio in *The Shrew* III. ii. Hortensio cannot appear, because he is masquerading as Licio, the music tutor. He goes out in this disguise at the end of III. i., so that it would be theatrically impossible for him to enter in his own person at the beginning of III. ii.: there would be no time for the necessary change of costume. It is reasonable to suppose, then, that in the hypothesized earlier play Hortensio did not disguise himself, and that this strand of the sub-plot was introduced during the revision, necessitating the ascription to another character of Hortensio's original part in III. ii. In *A Shrew* Aurelius's (*i.e.* Lucentio's) servant pretends at one point to be a music tutor; but Polidor does not disguise himself in any way.

At IV. ii. 54 there is another inconsistency in *The Shrew*. Tranio announces that Hortensio has gone to Petruchio's house:

Faith he is gone vnto the taming schoole.

But Hortensio has never stated his intention of doing so, either to Tranio or to anyone else.<sup>1</sup> The line quoted is part of a passage (IV. ii. 53-6) which is very closely paralleled in *A Shrew*, where, however, the statement that Polidor has gone to the taming school is made by Aurelius (*i.e.* Lucentio) to his servant. Now, unlike Tranio, Aurelius is justified in making this statement, for in *A Shrew* Polidor has previously, in the hearing of Aurelius and of Kate's father and two sisters, declared:

Within this two daies I wil ride to him [*i.e.* Ferando],  
And see how louingly they do agree.

(Sig. D2)

These lines occur in the course of the passage corresponding to *The Shrew* III. ii. 238-50. Hortensio is disguised as Licio, and cannot therefore make any such declaration. Again it looks as if in the earlier play Hortensio did not disguise himself. It looks as if *A Shrew* follows the earlier play in having him present in his own person in the passage corresponding to *The Shrew* III. ii. 238-50 and in making him state there his intention of going to Petruchio's house; and it looks as if Shakespeare, deciding in his revision to disguise him, was forced to dispense with him in his own person in III. ii. 238-50 and so with his statement of his intention, but nevertheless incongruously retained IV. ii. 53-6 from the earlier play, changing the speakers. It might alternatively be supposed that the writer of *A Shrew* deliberately corrected an anomaly in *The Shrew*. But the balance of probability seems to me to be decidedly against this, because there are, as

<sup>1</sup> See Daniel, *op. cit.* p. 166.

we shall see, inconsistencies and structural weaknesses in *A Shrew* itself, which suggest that the writer of that play was by no means highly skilled in plot-construction, and was hardly the sort of person who could be expected to take the trouble to correct defects in his model.

It seems to me, then, that at certain points the sub-plot of *The Shrew* gives evidence of being a revision of an earlier version agreeing with *A Shrew*. In this earlier version Hortensio did not disguise himself, and by making him do so Shakespeare produces inconsistency in the revised play.

Let us now turn to a third incongruity in *The Shrew*, also noticed by Daniel.<sup>1</sup> Kate is wooed and won by Petruchio at II. i. 182-317. The question of a husband for Bianca now arises, and at II. i. 325-91 Gremio and Tranio indulge in a contest before Baptista to determine which of them will secure Bianca's hand by offering the more generous marriage settlement. Hortensio cannot be present to take part in this contest since he is disguised as Licio. He has gone off as Licio at II. i. 168 and is to reappear as Licio at the beginning of III. i. Thus again, as Dover Wilson notes,<sup>2</sup> 'it would no doubt be theatrically awkward to bring him in clad as Hortensio to bid against Gremio and Tranio at II. i. 324'. But it must be disconcerting to any reader or spectator to observe that although Baptista, Gremio and Tranio have all known from the first scene of the play that Hortensio is a suitor for Bianca not one of them shows the slightest awareness of the fact here. Speaking to Gremio and Tranio Baptista says:

he of both

That can assure my daughter greatest dower,  
Shall haue my *Biancas* loue.

(II. i. 335-7)

He does not mention Hortensio's suit, nor does Gremio, nor Tranio.

The same thing happens in III. i. From the first scene of the play Lucentio knows that Hortensio is a suitor of Bianca. At I. i. 244-6 he directs Tranio to 'make one among these wooers' (*i.e.* Hortensio and Gremio) for reasons which he does not there give. The explanation of the procedure is hinted at in III. i. 34-7, where Lucentio, disguised as the pedant Cambio, says to Bianca: 'that Lucentio that comes a wooing, . . . is my man Tranio, . . . bearing my port, . . . that we might beguile the old Pantalowne'. The reference is to the beguiling of Gremio by Tranio's promise of a larger marriage settlement for Bianca than he, Gremio, can offer.<sup>3</sup> There is no mention of Hortensio, though the plan

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> *The Taming of the Shrew*, New Shakespeare ed., p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> Gremio is of course doubly beguiled—by Lucentio-Cambio, whom he believes to be interceding with Bianca on his behalf (see I. ii. 152-6), and by Tranio-Lucentio as above. It is certainly the latter deception which is referred to at III. i. 34-7: it is Tranio's disguise, not Lucentio's, that is being spoken of in the passage quoted.

of making Tranio pose as a wooer must have been formed to beguile Hortensio as much as Gremio.

In III. i. we have a good comic situation in which Lucentio and Hortensio, both disguised as tutors, Cambio and Licio, attempt at the same time to secure Bianca's attention: they indulge in mutual recrimination; and they convey their declarations of love by similar means (III. i. 31 ff., 73 ff.). Now Lucentio is annoyed with Licio because the latter appears to be acting amorously towards Bianca. Lucentio does not know that Licio is Hortensio, for Hortensio formed his plan of disguise while Lucentio was not on the stage (I. ii. 129-35). But Lucentio was on the stage at I. ii. 169-73 when Hortensio said that he would provide a musician to teach '*faire Bianca*, so beloued of me'. In III. i., therefore, Lucentio, observing the musician conversing intimately with Bianca, might be expected to guess that he was pleading Hortensio's suit: but apparently the thought of Hortensio does not enter his head in this scene. Furthermore, Hortensio is annoyed with Cambio on account of his amorous conduct towards Bianca. He gives not the slightest indication of suspecting that Cambio is wooing Bianca on behalf of Gremio: yet at I. ii. 152-6 he actually heard Cambio declare that he would plead with Bianca for Gremio.

Again, at IV. ii. 16-21 Hortensio, disguised as Licio, reveals his true identity to Tranio. Thereupon Tranio says:

Signior *Hortensio*, I haue often heard  
Of your entire affection to *Bianca*, . . .

This definitely implies that Tranio's knowledge of Hortensio's love is a mere matter of hearsay. But in the episode at I. ii. 216-78 Tranio actually met Hortensio and Gremio, was informed by them themselves of their love for Bianca, and stated his own position as that of a competitor with them. Tranio having proposed during this episode that he and Hortensio, along with Gremio, should become friendly rivals, and Hortensio having at I. ii. 277 accepted with others an invitation from Tranio to 'contriue' this afternoone, / And quaffe carowes to our Mistresse health', it is strange that at IV. ii. 22-3 Tranio should say that he has 'often heard' of Hortensio's affection for Bianca: apparently he has forgotten all about the earlier episode in question.

It seems to me that in *The Shrew* Shakespeare's only interest in having Hortensio as a suitor for Bianca is to motivate his disguising himself as Licio, a procedure which produces comic situations. After having got him disguised and playing the part of a secret wooer, Shakespeare silently drops him as an official suitor known as such to Baptista, Lucentio, Gremio and Tranio, and completely ignores the implications of certain passages pre-

<sup>1</sup> *I.e.* pass the time.

vious to the adoption of the disguise. And when the comic possibilities of the disguise have been exploited, he dispenses with him as even a secret wooer. At the end of III. i. Hortensio, piqued by Bianca's attention to Cambio, clearly states the possibility that he will renounce his suit (III. i. 89-92). In IV. ii. he becomes definitely convinced that Bianca favours Lucentio, whereupon he declares:

heere I firmly wov  
Neuer to woo her more, but do forswear her . . .  
(IV. ii. 28-9)

and then, a few lines later:

I wil be married to a wealthy Widdow,  
Ere three dayes passe, which hath as long lou'd me,  
As I haue lou'd this proud disdainful Haggard, . . .  
(*Ibid.*, 37-9)

Hortensio has loved Bianca for the whole duration of the play so far, and despite the fact that this widow has loved him for as long we have not heard of her until now, quite late in the play, she is mentioned with disconcerting abruptness. And she does not appear on the stage until the last scene of the play, where she is introduced to make a third in the contest of obedience.

I suggest that in giving Kate two sisters, wooed respectively by the characters corresponding to Hortensio and Lucentio, *A Shrew* preserves a feature of the lost play underlying *The Shrew*. I suggest that, re-working this lost play, Shakespeare saw that he could create a good comic situation by making Hortensio and Lucentio rivals for the same lady's hand and by disguising them both as tutors in opposition to each other. And so he reduced the shrew's two sisters to one. Having got Hortensio disguised he dropped him as an official suitor, with consequent inconsistency. Having exploited this comic situation he was left with the unsuccessful Hortensio. What is to happen to him? Lucentio is to be the successful lover: Gremio, the pantaloon, is the incongruous suitor who is very properly to be rejected and left isolated at the end: but it would be clumsy to leave Hortensio also unattached at the end. And so, at IV. ii. 37, to rescue the sub-plot from an impasse of his own making, Shakespeare simply invented a new female character with whom to unite Hortensio, and acquainted us with her existence in a very abrupt manner.

At IV. v. 62-3 in *The Shrew* Petruchio says to Vincentio, father of Lucentio:

The sister to my wife, this Gentlewoman,  
Thy Sonne by this hath married: . . .

At line 71 Vincentio asks, 'But is this true', and Hortensio replies, 'I doe assure thee father so it is'. Now, as Daniel says,<sup>1</sup> 'The only ground they

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 168.

can have for this assertion is Baptista's determination, in Act II. sc. i [lines 386-90], that Bianca should be married on the Sunday following Katharine's marriage. Petruchio's "by this" would seem to imply that that Sunday afternoon has now arrived. His assertion, however, that she was to be married to Lucentio is mere conjecture, but Hortensio's confirmation of it is in flat contradiction to the knowledge he has that both he and Lucentio (Tranio) in Act IV. sc. ii [lines 27-33] vowed to have nothing more to do with Bianca'. In his note on IV. v. 63 in the Arden edition of *The Shrew* Warwick Bond states, in my view reasonably, that 'the inconsistency is traceable to hasty adoption of the general situation of the old play'. By the 'old play' he means *A Shrew*, but I suggest hasty adoption of the general situation in the lost play postulated above, with which in my belief *A Shrew* agrees in this matter. If there were no rivalry for the hand of the lady wooed by Vincentio's son, then Petruchio and Hortensio would be entitled to assume that on the day appointed for her wedding it is he whom she has married.<sup>1</sup> There is no rivalry in *A Shrew*: and I believe that here *The Shrew* implies as anterior to it a version of the story agreeing with *A Shrew*.

In connection with the suggestion that behind *The Shrew* there lies an earlier play in which Kate had two sisters it is interesting to note that in Svend Grundtvig's collection of Danish folk-tales there is a story<sup>2</sup> on the subject of the taming of a shrewish wife which in certain respects closely resembles Shakespeare's (it is indeed the closest to it of all the extant folk-tale analogues) and in which the character corresponding to Kate has two sisters. It is quite possible that a similar story was current in England in the sixteenth century, and that the hypothesized early play was based upon it.

### III

In Section I it was argued that as regards the main plot *A Shrew* is not the source of *The Shrew* but is dependent upon *The Shrew* or upon a text close to that of *The Shrew*, and it was argued that *A Shrew* gives evidence of having been memorially transmitted. In Section II it was argued that in the sub-plot *The Shrew* gives evidence of being a re-working of a version agreeing in certain respects with that of *A Shrew*. Thus the theory is indicated that *A Shrew* is memorially dependent upon *The Shrew* not as we have it in the folio but as it stood at an earlier stage of its evolution. At this earlier stage the main plot was already in or near its final state but the sub-plot was not, and the revision of the earlier play into *The Shrew* as we have it in-

<sup>1</sup> If the rivalry motif were absent, then of course 'thy son' in IV. v. 63 would be the genuine Lucentio, not Tranio-Lucentio: but this does not affect the argument.

<sup>2</sup> See Reinhold Köhler, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, vol. III, p. 397; Karl Simrock, *Die Quellen des Shakespeare in Novellen, Märchen, und Sagen* (1870), vol. I, p. 345; A. H. Tolman, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. V (1890), p. 235.



volved principally the sub-plot.<sup>1</sup> Now the main plot of *The Shrew* is for the most part, I think, unmistakably Shakespearian. It follows that the postulated earlier play was Shakespearian, as regards the main plot at least.<sup>2</sup> The theory which I am recommending is essentially that stated by Bernhard ten Brink. Unfortunately ten Brink never published an account of the considerations which led to the formulation of his theory—he simply stated the theory itself.<sup>3</sup>

Creizenach<sup>4</sup> and Alexander,<sup>5</sup> arguing that *A Shrew* is dependent on *The Shrew* in its extant state, point out that in certain respects the sub-plot of *The Shrew* is closer to the plot of the ultimate source of both, Ariosto's *Suppositi* (translated into English by Gascoigne under the title of *Supposes*) than that of *A Shrew* is. They prefer to explain this by the hypothesis that the writer of *A Shrew* modified *The Shrew* than to explain it by the hypothesis that *The Shrew* relies for its sub-plot on both *A Shrew* and the ultimate source of *A Shrew*. With others<sup>6</sup> I can see nothing improbable about the supposition which Creizenach and Alexander reject; I see nothing incredible about the assumption that the sub-plot of the lost *Shrew* play was indebted to *Supposes* in certain respects and that Shakespeare, re-working it, reverted to *Supposes* for other elements.

If *A Shrew* can be described as a reported version of a Shakespearian 'first sketch' it must be classed apart from the other reported Shakespearian texts, and it must be regarded with special interest. We possess no authentic Shakespearian first sketch: how faithfully can we suppose that *A Shrew* represents the plot-outline of this alleged first sketch? It is quite possible to imagine a reporter making not inconsiderable changes in the plot-outline of his original, especially in the direction of simplification. But I can find no evidence that the sub-plot of the lost play was essentially different from that of *A Shrew*.

Creizenach and Alexander draw attention to certain defects in the sub-plot of *A Shrew* which in their opinion presuppose elements in the more complicated sub-plot of *The Shrew* and in the plot of *Supposes*. I do not see that their conclusion is necessary.

<sup>1</sup> It also, I imagine, involved the excision of the material concerning Sly after the end of the first scene of the play proper.

<sup>2</sup> The material concerning Sly was doubtless also Shakespearian in the earlier play. There are moments in passages involving Sly in *A Shrew* (even after the point where he disappears in *The Shrew*) at which one thinks one hears an echo of the true Shakespearian note.

<sup>3</sup> One remark of ten Brink's requires modification. He regards the common source of the two texts as a Shakespearian 'Jugendarbeit . . . die sich von der spätern Fassung namentlich auch dadurch unterschied, dass das aus den *Supposes* entlehnte Motiv ihrer einfachen Intrigue noch abging' (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XIII, 94). But the sub-plot of *A Shrew* contains elements derived from *Supposes* doubtless through the postulated lost play.

<sup>4</sup> *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, IV, 686, 693-8.

<sup>5</sup> *Times Literary Supplement*, 1926, p. 614.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I, 328.

In the sub-plot of *The Shrew*, and in *Supposes*, the access of suitors to the heroine being forbidden, the hero enters her father's house in a menial disguise, in order to have opportunities of meeting her. In *A Shrew* Aurelius poses as a rich merchant's son, and Creizenach and Alexander state that no reason is given for the disguise, which is in any case unnecessary, since the access of suitors to Kate's sisters is not forbidden.<sup>1</sup> It is true that no reason for Aurelius's concealment of his identity is specifically stated in *A Shrew*: but Warwick Bond holds that a motive is implied later on (sig. F2-F2'), this being 'the difference in rank between the son of the Duke of Sestos and Phylema'.<sup>2</sup> 'The true reason' for the deception, according to Bond, 'is that Alfonso would not venture to countenance Aurelius's match with Phylema, if he knew him for a prince'.<sup>3</sup> At any rate the passage referred to does supply us with a plausible motive for Aurelius's procedure, though it is not stated as such:

(Duke.) Alfonso I did not thinke you would presume,  
To match your daughter with my princely house,  
And nere make me acquainted with the cause.  
Alfon. my Lord by heauens I sweare vnto your grace,  
I knew none other but Valeria your man,  
Had bin the Duke of Cestus noble son,  
Nor did my daughter I dare sweare for her.

This motive might have been made quite clear in the lost *Shrew* play, and on this view the writer of *A Shrew*, a memorial reconstructor, has simply obscured it. The state of affairs in the sub-plot of *The Shrew* is not necessarily presupposed.

In the sub-plot of *The Shrew*, and in *Supposes*, the hero's servant adopts his master's identity, and, to further the latter's interests, becomes an ostensible suitor for the heroine's hand, presenting competition to an elderly wooer. In *A Shrew* Aurelius's servant Valeria adopts the rank (though not the name) of his master: but, Creizenach and Alexander argue, since in *A Shrew* there is no rivalry for the hand of Phylema, and since therefore the servant has no one to compete against, no purpose is served by his masquerade. Yet a reason is clearly implied for it in *A Shrew*. Aurelius says (sig. B2):

And now be thou the Duke of Cestus sonne,  
Reuel and spend as if thou wert my selfe,  
For I will court my loue in this disguise.

<sup>1</sup> In *A Shrew*, sig. B2, Polidor says to Aurelius: 'And if he [Ferando] compass his [Kate] to be his wife, / Then may we freely visit both our loues'. This seems at first sight to imply that the access of suitors to Kate's sisters has been forbidden. But the reason for Valeria giving Kate a music lesson in *A Shrew* is that if her attention is not distracted she will keep her two sisters at work in the house and prevent Aurelius and Polidor from courting them (see sig. C). And so, in the lines quoted from sig. B2, Polidor may simply be referring to this dog-in-the-manger attitude.

<sup>2</sup> *The Taming of the Shrew*, Arden ed., p. xix.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Arden ed., p. xlv, note 1.

Here is implied the very motive which in *The Shrew* first prompts the plan whereby Tranio masquerades as Lucentio. Lucentio resolves upon his own disguise, and Tranio asks :

who shall beare your part,  
And be in *Padua* heere *Vincentio's* sonne,  
Keepe house, and ply his booke, welcome his friends,  
Visit his Countrimen, and banquet them?

(I. i. 193-6)

It is to surmount this obstacle to Lucentio's disguising himself that the plan of Tranio's masquerade is first formed. Similarly in *A Shrew* someone must represent the Duke of Sestos's son if Aurelius is to pose as the son of a merchant. And in *A Shrew*, sig. C2<sup>v</sup>, we actually see Valeria sent off to fulfil this function. Aurelius says :

Well *Valeria*, go to my chamber,  
And beare him company that came to daie  
From *Cestus*, where our aged father dwels.

Valeria is obviously instructed here to pose as Aurelius and to discharge a duty of hospitality incumbent on Aurelius. It must of course be objected that a citizen of Sestos would very probably know the Duke's son by sight and instantly recognize Valeria's deception; but the same objection is to be made as regards *The Shrew*. We may say, then, that in *A Shrew* there is a reason for Valeria posing as the Duke's son, and this is the same as the reason first given in *The Shrew* for Tranio's posing as Lucentio. In other words, Valeria's masquerade is motivated even although *A Shrew* contains no rivalry. It may well be argued that the early Shakespearian play contained no rivalry and motivated Valeria-Tranio's disguise as in *A Shrew* and as in *The Shrew* I. i. 193-208.

In *A Shrew*, sig. C, Aurelius says :

*Valeria* as erste we did deuise,  
Take thou thy lute and go to *Alfonso's* house,  
And say that *Polidor* sent thee thither.

But this was not devised before; what was devised before was that Valeria should pose as the Duke of Sestos's son. The writer of *A Shrew* is guilty of an inconsistency here. But I would suggest that there is nothing inherently absurd in making Valeria, whose more important disguise is as the Duke's son, momentarily adopt another disguise for a special purpose, that of keeping Kate occupied so that at a particular time Aurelius and Polidor may court her sisters freely. The error in *A Shrew* is that the writer does not make absolutely clear what is happening, that Valeria is as it were inseting one disguise in another: it is quite possible that the early play of which in my view *A Shrew* is a memorial reconstruction made this clear. It may be that in the lost play there was a scene in which Valeria's interim

disguise as a music tutor was planned and that the writer of *A Shrew* omitted it, thus producing inconsistency in his own text. This inconsistency, and the blurring of the motive for Aurelius's concealment of his rank, suggest that the writer of *A Shrew* was not sufficiently expert in plot-construction to be the sort of person who, if reconstructing *The Shrew*, would go to the very considerable trouble of eradicating inconsistency in the latter by means of an extensive reorganization of the sub-plot.

The theory which seems to me most satisfactory in all respects may be summarized, then, as follows:

- (1) *A Shrew* is substantially a memorially constructed text, and is dependent upon an early *Shrew* play now lost.
- (2) *The Shrew* is a re-working of this lost play.
- (3) In the early play the Sly material and the main plot were at least largely Shakespearian, and were in or near their final state. (In his re-working Shakespeare excised the Sly material after the end of I. i.)
- (4) There is no reason to believe that *A Shrew* does not give us the main outlines of the sub-plot of the early play, allowing for some inconsistency and obscuration of motive for which the memorial reconstructor may be held responsible.

#### *Postscript*

It was only after completing this article that I had an opportunity of reading Mr. Raymond A. Houk's paper entitled 'The Evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew*' in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. LVII, pp. 1009-1038 (December 1942). As regards the relationship between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* Mr. Houk and I support the same hypothesis.

## TWO SETS OF SHAKESPEAREAN HOMOPHONES

By HELGE KÖKERITZ

Many persons resent having a joke explained, regardless of whether they have understood it or not; analysis, they feel, robs it of its bouquet and refreshing spontaneity. Yet, when jokes are three hundred and fifty years old, buried for some three centuries under a solid layer of linguistic change; when, moreover, such 'quips and quiddities' emanate from William Shakespeare, and when their explanation reveals the true meaning of seemingly obscure or trite passages, then it is the duty of the linguistic archaeologist to start digging and to elucidate. It is not his fault if—like the excavators of ancient Pompeii—he happens to uncover images that according to present standards are not quite proper. If any apology be necessary for the present display of broad language, one can appeal to the wise observation of the Swedish poet Anders Österling, made apropos of certain Pompeian frescoes: 'When sin has reached the venerable age of two thousand years, it is no longer sin but a matter for archæological research'.

Shakespeare indulged in more than one type of word-play, but for the student of early New English phonology his phonetic puns, i.e., his play on words of identical pronunciation, are of prime interest. One of the results of the so-called Great Vowel Shift at the beginning of the fifteenth century was the creation of a vast number of homonyms or homophones; grammarians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, for instance Butler (1634), Price (1643), Cooper (1685), Dyche (1709), Watts (1721), liked to group the more common of them together in tables of words pronounced alike. A good many of these early homophones have remained as such down to the present day; others have again become separated owing to later sound-changes. The latter group offers the greatest reward to the investigator, provided he understands the pronunciation of Elizabethan English and its historical background.<sup>1</sup> One example will suffice to show

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare's pronunciation differed much less from our own than is frequently assumed, but the strangest notions of its nature still prevail in many quarters. One of the most common misconceptions is that it was almost Chaucerian in character. Thus in *Excursions in English Drama* (New York, 1937), p. 114, R. Withington voices the quite unwarranted suspicion that the changes of pronunciation 'have been greater since the eighteenth century than between the days of Chaucer and those of Pope'. The fact is that in all essentials (except for the comparatively recent diphthongization of the New English representatives of M.E. 'ā' and 'ǣ', as in 'name', 'boat') modern Standard English was fully established in the first half of the eighteenth century; see, for instance, R. E. Zachrisson, *Pronunciation of English Vowels 1400-1700* (Göteborg, 1913), and my forthcoming *Mather Flint on Early Eighteenth-Century English Pronunciation* (in the press).

what consequences the disregard of this obvious prerequisite may have. In the Cambridge edition of *The Tempest*, Dover Wilson tries to account for the obscure 'cout' in the ballad snatch: 'Flout 'em and cout 'em / And scout 'em and flout 'em' (III. ii. 130-1), by adducing from *O.E.D.* the early spelling 'cout' for 'colt' and translating the word 'to befool'.<sup>1</sup> This suggestion, which has been adopted by Parrott,<sup>2</sup> cannot be substantiated by any phonological criteria; on the contrary, these criteria show that Shakespeare's 'cout' has no connection with 'colt' and that consequently the translation 'to befool' is wrong. For one thing, the second line is a mere repetition of the first, though with the verbs in a reversed order. Secondly, 'flout' and 'cout' must rhyme just as 'scout' and 'flout'. The phonological implication is that their ancestral vowel must have been M.E. 'ū'. 'Colt', on the other hand, has M.E. 'ou'. In early Standard English, including the dialects of London and surrounding areas, the reflexes of M.E. 'ū' and 'ou' were never levelled (except rarely before 'r', as in 'course' and 'four'). Thus while modern Standard English has respectively [au] and [ou] for these M.E. sounds, present-day Cockney has approximately [eu] and [ou] for the same sounds, and similarly the dialects of Essex and Suffolk.<sup>3</sup> Even though 'l' was regularly lost in 'colt' in these areas, the diphthongs were so unlike in Shakespeare's time that 'colt' could not possibly rhyme with 'flout'. The only plausible explanation of 'cout' is therefore that it is an error for 'scout', and most editors emend it accordingly.

Of the two sets of homophones I intend to discuss, the first, 'hour'—'whore', is a pun; the second set, 'told'—'tolled', has been included because, in my opinion, a too dogmatic use of the translation 'counted' has led to a slight misinterpretation of two passages in Shakespeare.

#### I. 'HOUR'—'WHORE'

Shakespeare's propensity for quibbling runs riot in the fourth act of *The Comedy of Errors*. Its sputtering verbal fireworks, which now seem tediously laboured, were doubtless greeted with lusty guffaws by the groundlings and the wits. Neither required the help of a commentator to relish a risqué innuendo; they knew from experience what a flexible medium Elizabethan English was for the inveterate punster. Fully attuned to the word-play of Dromio of Syracuse, and Adriana, they certainly got all the points in the following passage (IV. ii. 53-62), which the lapse of time has rendered obscure:

<sup>1</sup> *The Tempest*, ed. by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1921), p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> T. M. Parrott, *Shakespeare, Twenty-Three Plays and the Sonnets* (New York, 1938), p. 1074.

<sup>3</sup> H. Kökeritz, *The Phonology of the Suffolk Dialect* (Uppsala, 1932), §§ 132 ff., 140 ff.



Dromio.

. . . 't is time that I were gone.

It was two ere I left him; and now the clock strikes one.

Adriana.

The hours come back! That did I never hear.

Dromio.

O, yes; if any hour meet a sergeant, 'a turns back for very fear.

Adriana.

As if Time were in debt! How fondly dost thou reason!

Dromio.

Time is a very bankrupt and owes more than he's worth to season.

Nay, he's a thief too; have you not heard men say,

That Time comes stealing on by night and day?

If 'a be in debt and theft, and a sergeant in the way,

Hath he not reason to turn back an hour in a day?

The quibble on 'one'—'on' in l. 55 is an old friend,<sup>1</sup> commented on in most annotated editions of the play.<sup>2</sup> But the rest is silence in these editions. To my knowledge no-one has hitherto noticed the pun on 'hour' and 'whore',<sup>3</sup> which immediately renders ll. 56, 57, and 62 intelligible. The two words were pronounced with the same vowel in Shakespeare's time, and it seems a safe assumption that 'h' in 'whore' was either silent in current speech<sup>4</sup> or deliberately suppressed by the actor (Dromio may well have affected some kind of Cockney pronunciation); compare the quibbling on 'heir' and 'hair' in the same play (III. ii. 127) and on 'here apparent'—'heir apparent' in 1 *Henry IV*, I. ii. 65.

The levelling of M.E. 'ūr', as in 'hour', and M.E. 'ōr', as in 'whore', is well evidenced in early New English. In Suffolk documents of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 'scour' appears as 'sc(h)oryn(g)', 'skoryng'.<sup>5</sup> The sixteenth-century London diarist, Henry Machyn, has two instances of the spelling 'ore' for 'hour', viz. 'alff a nore' (2x),<sup>6</sup> which should be compared with the fifteenth-century spellings 'poar', 'pore', 'poor', for 'power', adduced by Zachrisson,<sup>7</sup> as well as 'pore' 4-6, 'poor' 6 (*O.E.D.*). *The Writing Scholar's Companion* (1695) couples 'pore', 'poor', 'power', 'pour' as pronounced alike, and also 'soure', 'sore', 'sower', 'soar', 'swore' (p. 94), but it is doubtful whether 'hoar', 'whore', 'hour', 'our' (*ibid.*) were all meant to be pronounced alike or merely the first two and the last two.

<sup>1</sup> A similar quibble on 'none'—'known', pointed out by R. E. Zachrisson, *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as taught by William Bullokar* (Uppsala, 1927), p. 108, will clarify ll. 26-34 of Act IV, Sc. ii of *Much Ado About Nothing*; note that Watts (1721) couples 'known' and 'none' as having the same pronunciation.

<sup>2</sup> For instance in *The Comedy of Errors* (The [American] Arden Shakespeare), p. 91.

<sup>3</sup> The status of the word 'whore' in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English is amusingly revealed by a spelling exercise in Richard Hodges, *A Special Help to Orthographie* (1643), p. 13: 'The beadle that whipt the *whores*, beeing very *hoarse*, when he went away he rode upon a *horse*'. If exact, this early equation of the representatives of M.E. 'ōr' (in 'whores'), M.E. 'ō' (in 'hoarse'; where the modern 'r' is excrescent), and M.E. 'ōr' (in 'horse') is very striking; it seems to have been ignored in all discussions of the intricate problem of how and when M.E. 'ōr', 'ōr', and 'ōr' were levelled.

<sup>4</sup> For the loss of 'h' in early London pronunciation see H. C. Wyld, *A History of Modern Colloquial English* (3rd ed., Oxford, 1936), pp. 294 ff.

<sup>5</sup> H. Kökeritz, *op. cit.*, § 311.

<sup>6</sup> J. G. Nichols, *The Diary of Henry Machyn* (Camden Soc. Publ., No. 42, London, 1848), pp. 29, 11, 16, and 18; see also Zachrisson, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

<sup>7</sup> R. E. Zachrisson, *Pronunciation of English Vowels 1400-1700* (Göteborg, 1913), p. 80.

Osborn (1688) likewise couples 'pour' and 'power', as do Watts (1721) and Flint (1740); Peyton (1756) transcribes 'shower' [chøer]—cf. the eighteenth-century spelling 'shore' (*O.E.D.*). In 1717 George Flint rhymed 'ours': 'powers': 'whores'.<sup>1</sup>

Of particular interest is the obsolescent Suffolk pronunciation [o:ə] for 'hour'. The development of the latter form must have been identical with that of M.E. 'cūrs' to modern 'course', taking place originally in the plural, where M.E. 'ūr' was followed by a consonant; from the plural the monophthong was analogically extended to the singular.<sup>2</sup> Whereas M.E. 'ū' in independent positions developed into the modern diphthong [au], M.E. 'ūr' followed by a consonant was not diphthongized but underwent a process of lowering which ultimately resulted in [o:ə]. Thus it was levelled with M.E. 'ōr',<sup>3</sup> and eventually also with M.E. 'ōr', 'our', and 'ör'. In this paper I shall not attempt to answer the difficult question what stage M.E. 'ūr' before a consonant had reached in Shakespeare's time;<sup>4</sup> the pronunciation of 'hour' and 'whore' may have been either [u:(ə)r] or [o:(ə)r]. The important fact to remember is that they were homophones.<sup>5</sup>

In southern and western dialects the pronoun 'a' (l. 56) is still indiscriminately used for 'he', 'she', 'it'; see *O.E.D.* and also my article 'Alexander Gill (1621) on the Dialects of South and East England'.<sup>6</sup> Its ambiguity was probably the reason why Shakespeare used it here, since it could refer to 'hour' as well as 'whore', thus furthering the double-entendre.

But the opportunities for quibbling afforded by the above passage are

<sup>1</sup> Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Stuart Papers* iv. 304.

<sup>2</sup> H. Kökeritz, *op. cit.*, § 311; *Anglia* Beiblatt XXIX. 173.

<sup>3</sup> This levelling occurred about 1400 when M.E. 'ō' had become 'ū'. Shakespeare's contemporary William Bullokar indicates this new pronunciation by spelling *whore* with oo (R. E. Zachrisson, *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time*, etc., pp. 64, 201).

<sup>4</sup> A very detailed treatment of the problem will be found in H. M. Flasdieck, *Studien zur schriftsprachlichen Entwicklung der neuenglischen Velarvokale in Verbindung mit R* (Halle, 1932; also *Anglia* LVI), § 121 ff.

<sup>5</sup> The gradual coalescence of so many M.E. vowels had its natural repercussions in their graphic representation. Professor Huntington Brown of the University of Minnesota has called my attention to the spelling 'owre' in the manuscript of Wyatt's fiftieth sonnet, 'The louer compareth his state to a shippe in perilous storme tossed on the sea'. In *Tottel's Miscellany*, however, the word appears as 'houre': 'And every houre, a thought in readinesse'. Wyatt's sonnet is merely a translation of Petrarch, sonetto in vita 137, where the corresponding line runs: 'A ciascun remo un penser pronto et rio' (quoted H. E. Rollins, *Tottel's Miscellany* [1557-1587] I. 38 [Cambridge, 1928-29]). In his notes to Wyatt's sonnet Rollins says (*op. cit.* II. 169): 'And every houre. A mistranslation of *a ciascun remo* "at every oar". The MS. has *owre*. "Houre" is certainly no mistranslation of Italian "remo"—how could it be? The explanation is simple enough: The printer of *Tottel's Miscellany* understood Wyatt's spelling 'owre' to be 'hour' and consequently changed it to the more common form 'houre', because there was nothing in the context to show that it actually represented 'oar'. Wyatt's original word was, of course, 'oar', spelled 'owre' (for similar spellings see *O.E.D.*), not 'hour'. The same mistake appears in E. C. Haugen, *A Concordance to the Complete Poetical Works of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Chicago, 1941), where on p. 125 'owre' is listed under 'hour'.

<sup>6</sup> *Studia Neophilologica* xi. 286 (1938/9).

not yet exhausted. 'Time is a very bankrupt', Dromio contends, explaining and elaborating on his first pun, because Time 'owes more than he's worth to season'. Of course, 'to season' means 'for the season', with a quibble on 'time and the season',<sup>1</sup> but there is apparently also a pun on 'seizin', which seems even better.

The 'hour'—'whore' pun occurs not only in *The Comedy of Errors*. It was obviously too good to be allowed a single appearance. When we next come across it, Shakespeare has subtly embodied it in a philosophical commonplace, whose outward innocence has so far deceived Shakespearean editors and commentators, including hypersensitive Thomas Bowdler. I am referring to *As You Like It*, II. vii. 26-8, where Jaques laughingly quotes Touchstone:

And so, from hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,  
And then, from hour to hour, we rot and rot;  
And thereby hangs a tale.

This brief passage contains at least two subsidiary puns which add to the coarseness of the quibble on 'hour'. The first is 'ripe', which not only means 'to ripen' but also 'to search, examine' (< O.E. *rȳpian*). The second is, of course, the pun on 'tale'—'tail'.<sup>2</sup> A possible third is 'rot', which may have been deliberately pronounced like 'rut'. Such a pronunciation of M.E. 'ō', though rarely recorded in modern dialects except from Wilts, Derby and Devon in 'clot' and 'dog', and from several Midland counties in 'cough',<sup>3</sup> is hinted at by Tiffin (1751), who had heard 'cough', 'long', 'tongue' pronounced with [ʌ] 'in some Midland Places';<sup>4</sup> Shakespeare's quibbling on 'tongs' and 'tongues' in *Twelfth Night* (I. iii. 97 ff.) is not an analogous case, since we have ample evidence that 'tongue' was pronounced with the vowel of 'long' in the incipient standard language.<sup>5</sup> If the coalescence of the reflexes of M.E. 'ō' and 'ū' had been more general than the above examples indicate, it would almost certainly have occasioned much quibbling; I can recall no relevant instance from Shakespeare, and since a pun on 'rut' is not essential for the understanding of the main

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Parrott, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> This pun reappears elsewhere in Shakespeare, e.g. *Othello* IV. i. 8-10. Like the pun on 'an aim'—'thy name' in *The Comedy of Errors* (III. i. 47) it proves what other phonological criteria have previously established (see, for instance, Zachrisson, *op. cit.*, p. 42) that the reflexes of M.E. 'ai' and 'ā' were pronounced alike in Shakespeare's time. It is regrettable, therefore, that these are given as [æi] and [ɛ:] respectively in A. Marckwardt's otherwise excellent handbook *Introduction to the English Language* (Toronto and New York, 1942), p. 228 ff., whose Shakespeare transcriptions follow Viëtor too closely and do not pay due heed to more modern works in the field. Viëtor's study of Shakespeare's pronunciation (published in 1907), which is based almost exclusively on his rhymes, with some comparative material from early grammars, has become so antiquated by now that it should be used with the greatest caution, if at all.

<sup>3</sup> J. Wright, *The English Dialect Grammar* (Oxford, 1905), Index.

<sup>4</sup> *Studia Neophilologica* VII. 93 (1934/5).

<sup>5</sup> See my paper, 'Guy Mieg's Pronunciation (1685)', in *Language*, April-June (1943).

word-play, it will suffice to call attention to the remote possibility of such a quibble. But we are no longer in doubt why Jaques's 'lungs began to crow like chanticleer' and why he 'did laugh sans intermission an hour by his dial'.

## II. 'TOLD'—'TOLLED'

Shakespeare has two instances of 'told' which, in my opinion, have suffered from the interpretative ingenuity of certain commentators. The first occurs in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (V. i. 370): 'The iron tongue of midnight hath *told* twelve', and the second in *Othello* (II. ii. 11): 'From this present hour of five till the bell have *told* eleven'. The obvious interpretation of 'told' would seem to be 'toll'd', but this is not countenanced by two well-known authorities, Schmidt and Kittredge. Schmidt (*Shakespeare-Lexicon*) cites these examples, the only ones of their kind in Shakespeare, as illustrations of the past tense of 'tell' (to count), and so does Kittredge in his edition of *M.N.D.* (1939) and *Othello* (1941); in the latter volume (p. 166) the reader is specially warned not to confuse this 'told' with 'toll'd'. Kittredge compares the *Othello* example with another line in the same play, 'But, O! What damned minutes tells he o'er / Who dotes, yet doubts' (III. iii. 169). This comparison is clearly irrelevant. In the first two quotations we are concerned with a bell that has '*told* twelve', etc., whereas the quotation from *Othello* III. iii. 169 refers to a human being who *tells over*, i.e. counts, the minutes. Nowhere in Shakespeare do we find the unambiguous present 'tell(s)', employed in the same way as the two cases of 'told', viz. in a phrase like 'the bell tells twelve', nor does *O.E.D.* record any instance of this alleged usage. On the other hand, Shakespeare has two relevant cases of 'toll' in such connection, viz. 'The country cocks do crow, the clocks do *toll* / And the third hour of drowsy morning name' (*Henry V*, IV. Chorus 15-16), and 'his tongue / Sounds ever after as a sullen bell / Remember'd *tolling*<sup>2</sup> a departing friend (2 *Henry IV*, I. i. 101-3). Other verbs he uses in connection with bells or clocks are 'beat', 'strike', 'ring', 'knoll', etc., e.g. 'the bell then *beating* one' (*Hamlet* I. i. 39), 'The Windsor bell hath *struck* twelve' (*The Merry Wives of Windsor* V. v. 1), 'The clock hath *stricken* three (*Romeo and Juliet* IV. iv. 4), 'If ever been where bells have *knoll'd* to church', 'And have with holy bell been *knoll'd* to church' (*As You Like It*, II. vii. 114 and 121), etc.

A spelling 'told' for 'toll'd' is what we should expect in Shakespeare's time; the early editions of *M.N.D.* and *Othello* adhere to the spelling

<sup>1</sup> Among the instances of 'tell' (to count) Schmidt, *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, erroneously includes 'When I do count the clock that tells the time' (Sonnet 12) and 'the sound that tells what hour it is' (*Richard II*, V. v. 55); here 'tell', of course, has the meaning 'to announce'.

<sup>2</sup> This is the reading of the Quarto (1600); the Folio has 'knolling'.

'told', but the third and fourth Folios of *Othello* write 'toll'd'. A perfect orthographic parallel is 'inscrol'd', which appears in the Quartos and Folios of *The Merchant of Venice* (II. vii. 72). Of interest are also the two cases of 'knoll'd' from *As You Like It*, which were originally spelled 'knoll'd' and 'knowld' respectively.

Now the objection is likely to be raised that 'till the bell have told eleven' is a case of poetic diction, a typical instance of Shakespeare's predilection for personification, which lends unusual vividness to his imagery, like the moonlight that 'sleeps upon this bank' or 'the morn, in russet mantle clad', which 'walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill'. True, the possibility of personification must not be ignored, but its absolute prerequisite is, of course, that it could be readily understood, not by a modern reader, who is likely to be deceived by the spelling 'told', but by Shakespeare's audience. The two forms 'told' and 'tolled' were pronounced alike in his day, though the sound used was a monophthong [o:] instead of the present diphthong [ou]. What linguistic associations or responses did the phrase 'till the bell have told eleven' evoke in the spectators who heard Othello's herald proclaim that there was to be 'full feasting from this present hour of five till the bell have told eleven'? Would any of them, even the most sophisticated wit, have apprehended [to:ld] otherwise than 'tolled'? I think that the answer must be 'no'. The cliché of the tolling bell—if I may so describe the close connection between 'bell' and 'toll'—was so firmly established as to bar effectively any other interpretation. It stands to reason that if personification had been intended, Shakespeare would have used another word than 'told', for instance 'counted' or the present form 'tells', which would at once have conveyed the idea he had in mind. However, in this particular case personification would have been a stylistic incongruity for the Herald's proclamation is a factual statement in prose, totally devoid of imagery. 'Told', *Othello* II. ii. 11, therefore means 'tolled' and not 'counted'.

The second instance of 'told' is less clear. It occurs in the first line of Theseus's final speech in Act V, which is in verse and which has at least one obvious case of personification, 'The heavy gait of night'. We may well argue that 'midnight', too, is personified here, and that this creation of the poet's mind makes its 'iron tongue' count twelve. A tongue is capable of many activities in Shakespeare: it can speak, tell (= state), proclaim, pronounce, plead, scorn, wrong, name, etc., and even sound; but it never counts, reckons, numbers or tells (in the sense of 'to count'). It is always a person who does the counting (or telling). Moreover, 'tongue' is Shakespeare's only term for the clapper of a bell, except once, in *Much Ado About Nothing* (III. ii. 13), where we hear that Benedick 'hath a heart as sound as a bell and his tongue is the clapper'. In that sense it is employed



in the following passage from *King John* (III. iii. 37-39), which closely resembles the one in *M.N.D.*: 'If the midnight bell / Did, with his iron tongue and brazen mouth, / Sound on into the drowsy ear of night'. We are hardly justified in saying that 'midnight bell' is personified here; Shakespeare is merely playing—and playing very cleverly for that matter—on the various meanings of the four words 'iron', 'tongue', 'brazen', 'mouth'. Nor am I convinced that there is personification in the *M.N.D.* passage. 'Iron tongue' may simply stand for 'bell' in the same way as beaver stands for 'helmet' in 'I saw young Harry, with his beaver on' (1 *Henry IV*, IV. i. 104), that is, both 'tongue' and 'beaver' are cases of synecdoche or, more precisely, *pars pro toto*. This interpretation would render the whole expression 'the iron tongue of midnight' equivalent to 'the midnight bell' in the above quotation from *King John*. Regardless of whether Shakespeare's audience understood 'iron tongue' in that way or took it more literally as 'iron clapper', their interpretation of 'told' as 'toll'd' may be taken for granted, because to them the natural and obvious business of an iron clapper or bell was to toll (or beat, strike, ring, knoll, sound), but not to count. This circumstance, of course, does not preclude the possibility that in Shakespeare's mind there was an indistinct merging of the two meanings of the phoneme 'tol(le)d', or perhaps, as in the case of 'iron tongue and brazen mouth', a deliberate, subtle play on the two senses,<sup>1</sup> in other words a blending of synecdoche and personification.

Yet the problem may be viewed from another angle. Suppose that the spelling of the Quartos and Folios had been 'toll'd' or 'toll'd' instead of 'told'. Would not every commentator then have taken the word at its face value, in spite of the fact that the spelling in no way affects its phonetic basis? If anyone had ventured to suggest that 'toll'd' might stand for 'told' (counted), all the arguments marshalled above for the interpretation of 'told' as 'toll'd' would presumably have been advanced to show the absurdity of such a suggestion. Special emphasis would naturally have been placed on the spelling 'toll'd', although theoretically a sixteenth-century spelling means nothing in this case, except for the fact that the relative frequency of the group -old (in 'old', 'hold', 'told', 'sold', 'gold', etc.) would render a spelling 'told' for 'toll'd' far more likely than 'toll'd' for 'told'. In brief, the interpretation of 'toll'd' would have been identical with that proposed above for 'told'.

Thus, we see how at times undue consideration of the graphic symbol is apt to colour the interpretation of the phonetic unit behind that symbol. Since Shakespeare wrote solely for the theatre-goer, the exclusive appeal of

<sup>1</sup> We have a deliberate pun on 'told'—'toll'd' in Thomas Hood's ballad 'Faithless Sally Brown': 'They went and told the sexton, and / The sexton toll'd the bell'. (*The Works of Thomas Hood*, ed. by his Son and Daughter, [London, 1882-93], v. 127).



his diction was aural. With regard to 'told' in the quotations from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Othello* considerations of meaning and usage overwhelmingly favour this aural appeal, that is, the sense 'tolled'; the possibility of personification, which would be totally visual in character, is too vague to justify any other interpretation.

[After this article had gone to press a postscript was received from the author :

'When writing this article, I was unaware that there existed in Shakespeare an instance of *toll* which establishes beyond any doubt that he used *toll* followed by a numeral indicating the hour. In *Hamlet*, I. i. 39, Bernardo says, according to the Folio text : "The bell then beating one". The corresponding line in the First Quarto reads, however : "The bell then *towling* one". This is an exact parallel of the *Othello* phrase "till the bell have *told* eleven" and of the more poetic line in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* "The iron tongue of midnight hath *told* twelve". And it proves my contention that these two cases of *told* actually stand for *tolled*.'—Ed. R.E.S.

## SOME NOTES ON THE PLAYERS IN OXFORD 1661-1713

By SYBIL ROSENFELD

A good deal of work on this subject has been done by the late W. J. Lawrence, the late R. Crompton Rhodes, Dr. F. S. Boas, the Rev. Montagu Summers, Mr. Leslie Hotson and Miss Autrey Wiley. In the following notes I have confined myself to the years for which I have some new material to offer and have tried to avoid repetition of the results of the researches of others. The complete history of the players' visits to the University after the Restoration remains to be written.

1661. The identity of the company which first visited Oxford after the Restoration, and whose performances Anthony à Wood so assiduously attended, remains obscure. W. J. Lawrence<sup>1</sup> quotes a letter from Timothy Halton to Sir Joseph Williamson of 4 July 1661 about the forthcoming visit of Charles II: 'The play is made by Dr. Llewellyn,<sup>2</sup> but they are so in want of actors, that they fear being obliged to make use of the Red Bull players, now in Oxford'. He goes on to say that this offers a clue to the identity of the players. But there is a difficulty: it was Killigrew who took over Mohun's Red Bull company and transferred it to Gibbon's Tennis Court in November 1660. This became the King's company. Davenant and his Duke's Company were at Lisle's tennis court and never acted, as far as we know, at the Red Bull. Yet Mrs. Anne Gibbs and Mrs. Davenport (Roxalana), the only two players who we know were in the company that visited Oxford, were both actresses of Davenant's Company. There are three possible solutions to this dilemma: (1) that Halton was in error with regard to the name of the company: (2) that Davenant's company did act sometimes, unbeknown to theatrical historians, at the Red Bull: (3) that the company which visited Oxford was a mixed one. The last seems the most likely, but further evidence is needed before the question can be settled.

1670-2. In 1661 the players acted at the King's Arms, Holywell; in 1669 the Duke's Company had a successful season at the Guildhall. It has not been noticed that in 1670 a new playhouse was being erected. H. E. Salter

<sup>1</sup> *T.L.S.*, 28 February 1929.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Martin Llewellyn. He had written a play for college performance before the Restoration. See his *Men-Miracles*, 1646, which includes verses 'to my Lord B. of Ch. when I presented him a Play' and 'to Dr. F. Deane of Ch. Ch. now Vicechancellor of Oxford, upon the same occasion'.

in his *Surveys and Tokens*,<sup>1</sup> quotes from the City Council Book an entry, dated 29 June 1670, in which the Mayor was instructed by the City Council to take proceedings against any parishioners of St. Mary Magdalen, who 'should endeavour to disturb his royal highnesse the Duke of Yorke's servants or their workemen in building their play-house in Broken Heys where the City have gave them leave to build'. This is the only record we have that the players were in Oxford in 1670. The Act was cancelled on 28 June, but it seems probable that the players were allowed to remain, since the Council's instruction dated from the following day. If they did act in Oxford in 1670 it would help towards a solution of the problem of the prologue, 'Your most obliging kindness one year shown'.<sup>2</sup> The two manuscript versions of this prologue in the Bodleian have the following variants in the first line: Rawl. Poet. 19, 146: 'Your most obligeing kindnesse last year shewne', Eng. Poet. E. 4: 'Your civil kindness last year shewn'. The latter is entitled 'The Prologue to the Oxford Schollers at the Act there, 1671'; the former, 'Mr. Dryden's 2nd Prologue for ye Players at Oxford'. One of the difficulties has been that the date 1671 was unacceptable because it was not known that the players were in Oxford the previous year. There is now no reason to doubt that the date is correct. There is another complication with regard to the players' visit in 1671: Wood<sup>3</sup> twice states that *Cambyeses* was played in Oxford in 1671, and in one case gives the date as 12 July and the place as the New Tennis Court; whereas MS. Eng. Poet. E. 4 contains 'The Prologue to Cambyeses at Oxford, 1672', and attributes it to Elkanah Settle, the author of the play. This prologue says:

Your last kind Entertainment was so great,  
We may acknowledge but not pay the debt—  
And therefore as your right you should exact  
Our tributary thanks for your last Act.

These lines must either refer to the Act of 1669 in which case the prologue must have been spoken in 1671, a date which agrees with Wood, or to the Act of 1671 in which case the ascription of the prologue to 1672 is correct. If it was spoken in 1671, not only is the ascription to 1672 incorrect but we have the difficulty of two prologues in one year. The only other year when we know of two being spoken during the season was in 1681. The alternative that the prologue was spoken in 1672 seems more reasonable. Then either Wood was wrong in stating that *Cambyeses* was acted in 1671, or, more likely, it was acted both years. Of course it is curious that Settle only

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Historical Society Pub.*, 1923, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *A Collection of Poems*, printed by Collins, Ford, Cademan, 1673. The printed version is considerably shorter than those of the manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> *Life and Times*, ed. Andrew Clark, 1891-1900, Vol. I, p. 226; *Athenae Oxoniensis*, ed. P. Bliss, 1813-20, Vol. IV, p. 684.

wrote his prologue for the second occasion, but this seems to be the least of the difficulties involved.

To return to the prologue, 'Your most obliging kindness'; the authorship has been much in dispute. The MS. attribution to Dryden is obviously an error, since he was at that time under contract to the King's Company and would hardly be writing for their rivals. In the MS. Eng. Poet. E. 4 there are initials attached to the prologue, both in the table of contents and at the end of the prologue itself. W. J. Lawrence read them as T. S. and tried to make out a case for Shadwell; Mr. Hugh Macdonald<sup>1</sup> takes them as F. S., but a careful examination of the handwriting of the manuscript convinces me that they are J. S. or I. S. This, however, does not take us much further.

With regard to the playhouse, the edifice at Broken Hays appears to have been used only for the 1670 season, since Wood speaks of the players at the New Tennis Court in 1671. According to Mr. Macdonald<sup>2</sup> this tennis court was built by Thomas Burnham in 1670, south of Blue Boar Lane, St. Aldgate's, whereas Broken Hays was in the neighbourhood of Gloucester Green. Settle's prologue apologises for the bareness of the tennis court theatre:

But then our House wants ornament and Scene,  
Which the chiefe grandeur of a Play maintain.

1674. In this year the King intervened to obtain an extension of time for his players. In a letter<sup>3</sup> to the Vice-Chancellor of the University dated 9 June, he writes: 'Whereas our company of actors at our theatre royal have asked leave to go down to represent several tragedies and comedies about the time of your Act now approaching, and for this purpose the Duke of Ormonde, Chancellor of the said University, has given them a letter to you, the Vice-Chancellor, to permit them to represent their plays for 12 days, and whereas they have besought us, as they intend to act but once every day to interpose with you to grant them a longer time, we recommend that leave be given them for 20 days, provided they act but once every day'. Twelve days was the usual time allotted when they acted twice a day.

1677. Oxford was visited by the Duke of Ormonde's Irish players. The epilogue on this occasion was written by the comedian Jo. Haynes and is extant in a manuscript in the Harvard Library<sup>4</sup> of which there is a copy by Thorn-Drury in the Bodleian. It is a poor production, greatly inferior to the dignified utterances of Dryden, but it is interesting as alluding to some scandal that took place in connection with the King's Company's visit in either 1674 or 1676.

<sup>1</sup> *John Dryden. A Bibliography*, 1939, p. 138, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>3</sup> *S. P. Dom.*, 1673-5, p. 278.

<sup>4</sup> Information kindly supplied by Messrs. Dobell of Tunbridge Wells.

The Town Shee Players that lead such merry lives,  
 Came t'other years to be made Substantives,  
 One had her wish, for in a merry mood  
 She was both seen, felt, heard and understood;  
 She was understood so well—  
 That if she had stay'd, I'm told to her renown,  
 She 'ad civilly been carted out of Town.

There is a reference to the smallness of the tennis court theatre :

Methinks you look in this small spot alone  
 Like all th'Apostles in a Cherry stone.

1680. This year Timothy Halton, the Vice-Chancellor, had applications both from the Duke of Ormonde and the King's players. The Duke of Ormonde, who was Chancellor of the University, was first in the field and a letter<sup>1</sup> from him to Halton 'On behalf of the Duke of Ormonde's actors, who desire to play at Oxford at the time of the Act' is dated from Dublin Castle, 30 March 1680. The Lord Chamberlain's first letter<sup>2</sup> from Windsor is dated 15 May. Halton's letter to Sir Leoline Jenkins expressing his dilemma in having to choose between them is quoted by W. J. Lawrence<sup>3</sup> from Payne Collier's manuscript 'History of the Restoration Stage' in Harvard University Library; but it is also printed in *S. P. Dom.*, 1680, p. 497, with the date 30 May 1680. The Bishop of Oxford wrote to Ormonde that the King's players had had a cold reception 'in their desires to be received here this Act'<sup>4</sup> and that it had needed two letters from the King to get them accepted. This cold reception may link up with an interesting letter from Timothy Halton,<sup>5</sup> the date and addressee of which are unknown, which has not hitherto been cited in connection with the players' visits. It is worth quoting in full in this context. 'My Lord I rec'd yesterday a letter from y<sup>r</sup> Lords<sup>p</sup> in favour of his Maty<sup>a</sup> Comedians, who desire first to erect their stage in the place w<sup>ch</sup> formerly they used, & then to haue a much longer time allowed them then is already allotted to them. My Lord, as to the Place w<sup>ch</sup> is now assigned them, they confesse this to be much more convenient then that w<sup>ch</sup> formerly they made use of, & they have it on easier termes, so y<sup>r</sup> Lords<sup>p</sup> will not for the future be troubled with any complaint upon this score. As for the time w<sup>ch</sup> is assigned them to Act their Plays, that is the same y<sup>t</sup> formerly was granted to y<sup>m</sup> before y<sup>e</sup> warrs. And the University doth beseech y<sup>r</sup> Lords<sup>p</sup> most humbly to represent to his Ma<sup>ty</sup> the great inconueniency w<sup>ch</sup> should befall the University if any longer time should be granted to them. Seuerall young Gentlemen of good Estates & fortune are vndone by them, and the poorer sort of scholars spend

<sup>1</sup> Hist. MSS. Comm., Ormonde, IV, p. 619.

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in Allardyce Nicoll's *Restoration Drama*, p. 295.

<sup>3</sup> *T.L.S.* 28 February 1929, p. 163.

<sup>4</sup> Hist. MSS. Comm., Ormonde, V., p. 338, quoted by L. Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*.

<sup>5</sup> J. R. Magrath, *The Queen's College*, 1921, Vol. II, p. 64, n. 6.

that money on these Plays w<sup>th</sup> should support y<sup>m</sup> for a considerable space time in this place & when y<sup>t</sup> small stock fails y<sup>m</sup> they sell their books to procure more. They usually carry hence 500<sup>l</sup> or 600<sup>l</sup> to the vtter vndoing of severall respectable persons who might otherwise haue been very serviceable to his Ma<sup>ty</sup> the church and kingdome. Upon all occasions the University hath found y<sup>r</sup> L<sup>d</sup>s<sup>p</sup> very ready to shew y<sup>m</sup> all y<sup>e</sup> good offices w<sup>th</sup> lay in y<sup>r</sup> way; and the continuance thereof is most humbly begged by the University as also by y<sup>r</sup> most humble servt. T. H.'

Halton was Vice-Chancellor 1679-82, 1685-6, so that this letter may refer to players' visits in 1680, 1681, 1682 or 1686. The only clue in favour of 1680 is the reference to a new place of acting, for it was in that year that the players transferred from the New Tennis Court to Robert à Wood's tennis court near Merton. We do not know of any further changes.

1686. We do not hear of the players being in Oxford between 1683, when the Prologue and Epilogue printed in Tom Brown's *A Collection of Miscellany Poems*, 1699, were spoken, and 1686 when Wood<sup>1</sup> records that, although the Act was cancelled at the last minute the Vice-Chancellor gave 'leave to all players and poppets to shew, purposely to please the people'.

The 'Epilogue to the University of Oxon. by Mrs. Cook', printed without date in *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1698, Pt. III, p. 173, must belong to this year. The following lines in this epilogue refer to the production of *Albion and Albanus* with Grabut's music in June 1685, and to Dryden's conversion to Catholicism. The exact date of Dryden's conversion is not known, but Wood<sup>2</sup> quotes verses 'made by one John Driden, poet Laureat, who turn'd papist in May or June 1686'.

In these our Pious times, when writing Plays  
Was thought a Sin,—  
And nothing Sanctify'd but *Opera's*.  
When to *Pindarick* Farce, true Sense gave place,  
And Musick yielded to *Grabugh's* Grimace,  
Then to expect a Prologue was in vain,  
Not Gold its wonted Influence cou'd retain,  
Oxon must never hear a Laureat's Muse again. }  
In a new Convert, after such a Call,  
To write for you, had been Heretical:  
And truly 'twas not Reason to desire,  
He shou'd once more incur the Church's Ire, }  
Faith, he was fley'd enough for th' *Spanish Fryer*.)

1691. The history of the players' visits after the Revolution is not so well known. Their first after the accession of William III and Mary was made in

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Times*, Vol. III, p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



1691. On 30 June of this year the Queen wrote to the Vice-Chancellor:<sup>1</sup> 'Whereas some of the Company of Comedians have humbly besought us to recommend them to you for permission to act in our University, during the space of 12 days, beginning on the 10th of July next, we being pleased to grant their request, have thought fit to recommend it to you, to permit the said comedians to act there with such liberty as they have formerly enjoyed.' It was during this season that 'A long Prologue to a Short Play. Spoken by a Woman at Oxford Drest like a Sea Officer' was delivered. This appears in *Poems on Affairs of State*, Pt. III, 1698, p. 581, and with variants as 'A long Prologue to a short, and an ill-Acted Play, spoken by a Woman at Oxford; in the year, 1691' in *A Pacquet from Parnassus*, 1702, Vol. I, p. 17.

1693. It has not hitherto been noticed that the players returned to Oxford this year. On 3 July the Queen again wrote to the Vice-Chancellor<sup>2</sup> 'recommending that permission be granted to some of our company of comedians to act at Oxford for twelve days, beginning the 7th inst.' On 17 July Roger Fleming wrote to Daniel Fleming that his expenses had increased 'by reason we have had y<sup>e</sup> Kings plaieres here'.<sup>3</sup> No prologue or epilogue has yet been discovered for this year.

1703. This is the next year in which we can be sure of the players' visit, though the Vice-Chancellor is rumoured to have allowed them in 1698.<sup>4</sup> As noted by Miss Wiley,<sup>5</sup> the prologue, written by Joseph Trapp and spoken by Betterton, appeared first as a broadside and then in *The Players Turn'd Academicks or, a Description (in Merry Metre) Of their Translations from the Theatre in Little Lincolns-Inn-Fields, to the Tennis-Court in Oxford. With a Preface Relating to the Proceedings of the University the last Act: As also the Wadhamite Prologue that was Spoken there, with a Prologue and Epilogue, by way of Answers to it, at the Theatre Royal, 1703*. From the preface we learn that 'neither the Scholars did their Business to a General Satisfaction, nor the Players theirs; . . . never was such wretched Acting seen by those who go under the Name of Her Majesty's Servants, and never such failures in attempting after Wit, by those who have the Characters of Scholars, since Oxford had its first Foundation. So that the Stage shew'd as much Disrespect to the University by carrying down so Imperfect a Company, as the University did to the Nobility and Gentry by Inviting 'em down to See and Hear what was not worth their while to take

<sup>1</sup> *S. P. Dom.*, May 1690-Oct. 1691, p. 430.

<sup>2</sup> *S. P. Dom.*, *ibid.*, p. 211.

<sup>3</sup> J. R. Magrath, *The Flemings in Oxford*, Vol. III, p. 126.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Dr. Boas, *T.L.S.*, 14 March 1929, p. 206.

<sup>5</sup> *Rare Prologues and Epilogues*, 1940, p. 124. She does not mention the title of the pamphlet. The prologue is also printed in *The Oxford and Cambridge Miscellany*, 1708.

the Pains of a Journey for'. As we have seen, bad acting had been a complaint in 1691.

The Prologue and Epilogue by way of answer to the Oxford one were spoken by Mills at Drury Lane on 16 and 23 July to *A Fool's Preferment*.<sup>1</sup> The idea was to make known to London audiences what the rival company was saying about them in Oxford. Mills spoke a 'Prefatory Prologue' in the middle of which he introduced the actual prologue spoken at Oxford by Betterton. In it the London audiences were branded as degenerate, 'Debauch'd with Farce, and negligent of Wit', as being without taste, and as desiring vicious entertainments, whilst those at Oxford were lauded in comparison:

Now, to our wish, we have an Audience found,  
Which will be pleas'd with Sense, as well as Sound;  
You only can Reform th'Unthinking Age,  
Redeem our Credit lost, and Dignify the Stage.

Having left the London playgoers to digest these insults during the play, Mills proceeded to vindicate them in the epilogue, at the same time calling upon them to

Let just Resentments work upon your Mind,  
Support our Interest, and our Cause assist,  
Nor stand by them, when those they Flatter'd Hiss'd.

A note to this last line explains that the prologue at Oxford was hissed there for three days. It had been spoken before *Love for Love*, which the epilogue hastens to point out was not exactly a 'modest' play.

This clever piece of propaganda was not the first attack made by the Drury Lane Company on the visit of their rivals to Oxford. On the very day on which Betterton was speaking Dr. Trapp's prologue, a prologue<sup>2</sup> was spoken at Drury Lane to *Timon of Athens*, in which Oxford audiences and the *L.I.F.* Company were condemned.

Follies may take, and Trifles may go down  
As things novel to those that wear the Gown,  
And Tumblers, and French Girls, and fam'd L'épine  
May by Collegiate Eyes with Pleasure seen,—  
Let t'other house, who a Learn'd Audience want,  
Apply themselves to Learnings Sacred Font,  
And like Old Mistresses whose Charms are gone,  
Leave their Abode for Places more unknown,  
We'll stand our Ground, your Pleasure to Pursue,  
Having the Men of Sense in having you.

1713. The last known visit of the players to Oxford before the Licensing Act of 1737 forbade any acting within the University or within five miles

<sup>1</sup> They are advertised in the *Daily Courant*, 15 July 1703.

<sup>2</sup> 'A New Prologue Relating to the Act at Oxford', dated in manuscript on the B.M. copy, 15 July 1703. *Timon of Athens* was played at Drury Lane on 5 July.

of the city, took place in 1713. The prologue written by Thomas Tickell and spoken by Cibber on this occasion is well known; it was printed as a broadsheet by Tonson in 1713<sup>1</sup> and reprinted in Steele's *Poetical Miscellanies* of 1714. It has, however, passed unnoticed that the epilogue to this final season also exists and is printed in an obscure volume entitled *The University Miscellany*, 1713. The epilogue is of sufficient interest to be reprinted in full.

The *Players* EPILOGUE at their leaving the University this Summer.

The *Players* Epilogue. Spoken by Miss WILLIS.

Our Plays concluding, now we change the Scene,  
And every Hero is Himself again:  
CÆSAR no more *Rome's* Liberty disputes,  
But doffs his Brilliant Buskins for his Boots.  
OTHELLO leaves his DESDEMONA undone,  
And ambles jocund on his Titt for *London*:  
He and IAGO now, like old Hail-fellows,  
May drown Dramatick Quarrels at an Alehouse.  
Ev'n spruce Sir COURTLY, late so nice and fine,  
Now condescends with dirty HOB to dine.  
Our Heroes too, tho' fine as Hands can deck 'em,  
Will soon their haughty Stomachs stay with Mutton Chops at *Wickham*.  
For me, alas! I fear my Stomach's gone;  
Wou'd I had never seen this Book-learn'd Town!  
Not that you less to me than all are kind:  
But when I go, I leave my Heart behind.  
Our *London* Beaus are easily withstood:  
But here, I find, I am but Flesh and Blood.  
Oh! that this Heart, which ne'er yet felt Mishap,  
Must be subdu'd at length by Golden-tufted Cap!  
You've Masters here of Arts (I'm sure) unknown;  
'Tis not for nought you wear the Tissue-Gown.  
Is it in OVID's Art you learn to hide the Hook,  
Whilst you surprize and take us by the Book?  
Must of my Hopes, some Dowdy be Partaker?  
Must I resign you to a vile Bed-maker?  
Well, first I see, I must the Pain endure,  
And find out healing Salads for my Cure:  
Fail that, then fatal sure the *Oxford* Garb is,  
*Hei mihi quod nullis amor est medicabilis herbis*.  
But hold! was ever such an heedless Elf,  
To talk of nothing but my slender self?  
My Orders were, our humble Thanks to pay  
For lavish Favours done to ev'ry Play.  
Beyond our Hopes we've found a Welcome here,  
And wish (with some of you) it might be ev'ry Year.

<sup>1</sup> Miss Wiley mentions a copy in Worcester College Library, but there is also one in the British Museum.

'Tis hard, methinks, old Rules we should not follow,  
 Since *semel in anno ridet* APOLLO.  
 But since your learned Jubilees are scarce,  
 We must be humbly patient for some Years;  
 Then I, perhaps, may see you less to Love inclin'd,  
 And be reveng'd on all the Golden Tufts I leave behind.

From Cibber's *Apology*<sup>1</sup> we learn that *Cato* and *Julius Caesar* were performed this year; the epilogue adds *Othello*, *Sir Courthy Nice* and Cibber's *Hob, or The Country Wake*. The last light entertainment is unexpected after the prologue's boast that 'To You our fam'd, our Standard Plays we bring'. Cibber tells us that *Cato* was particularly popular; Dr. George Smalridge wrote to Addison on 2 August: 'I have given myself ye pleasure of seeing *Cato* acted'.<sup>2</sup> On 14 July Dr. William Stratford wrote to Edward Harley: 'Our Act is over and without the least disorder; nothing more to be done, but seeing plays and eating and drinking for a few days more'.

The season, according to Cibber, was so successful that the players were able to give £50 towards the repair of St. Mary's (the University) Church. This was not the first time that part of the profits had been donated to this purpose, and the payment was probably obligatory. In Thomas Baker's comedy, *An Act at Oxford*, 1704, Act I, Sc. 1, there occurs the following dialogue:

*Lampoon*: Gentlemen you'll be at the Play? We all go this Ev'ning out o' pure Religion.

*Smart*: Religion?

*Lampoon*: Ay, Sir, for the Town of Oxford has oblig'd the Players, to give a Night towards rebuilding the Church that fell down.

This must refer to the season of 1703. Another payment was made in 1706. Defoe, railing against the presence of the players at the University, in *A Review of the State of the English Nation*, 3 August 1706, asks: 'Was Sir John Falstaff a sober play, which you went *in form* to encourage, and which you had acted for the Repair of a Church', and in a subsequent paper<sup>4</sup> he mentions that the players had raised a fund of £50 for repairing a chapel. It looks as though the Vice-Chancellor made it a condition of the players' visits that one night's profits should be for the benefit of the University Church, just as many mayors made it a condition to strolling players that a night's profits should be given to the poor.

1799. The epilogue of 1713 foresees that a few years would elapse before there would be another Act, and the players would be allowed to return. The actors little knew that it would not be before the end of the century.

<sup>1</sup> Everyman ed., p. 238. Cibber inaccurately gives the year as 1712; see letter from W. J. Lawrence, *T.L.S.* 28 February 1929, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> R. E. Tickell, *Thomas Tickell and the Eighteenth Century Poets*, 1931, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Hist. MSS. Comm., *Duke of Portland*, Vol. VII, p. 154.

<sup>4</sup> Dated 10 August.

R. Crompton Rhodes<sup>1</sup> found a note by James Winston that Thornton fitted up the tennis court as a theatre in 1802, and had permission to play every three or four years during the vacation. He suggested that the ban was probably removed about 1793 when Thornton became the Manager of the Windsor Theatre. A search through the *Oxford Journal* of the 1790's has revealed nothing earlier than September 1799. From the issue of 21 September we learn that Thornton's company had given readings at the Racket Court, under the patronage of the Oxford Loyal Volunteers, of *The Rivals* and *The Stranger*, and that on the following Monday *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pizarro* would be given. The scenery is advertised as new and by the first masters, the dresses after those of Drury Lane by Brooks and Heath, who would attend to dress the characters. There can be little doubt that the 'reading' was a mere guise to cover the company against the letter of the law. From subsequent years we learn that the Racket Court was in St. Aldgate's, probably the same as the New Tennis Court used by their predecessors in 1671. The long dramatic silence had at last been broken, but another century was to elapse before prejudices were finally swept away.

<sup>1</sup> *T.L.S.* 21 February 1929, p. 140.

## POPE AND 'ENGLAND'S ARCH-POET'

By NORMAN AULT

The popular conception of Pope's character and work is being gradually modified as a result of the recent researches of scholars who have left the well-known and safe highways of eighteenth-century literature for its more exciting if more hazardous byways as yet uncharted. Pope the pastoralist, Pope the critic, Pope the translator, Pope the satirist, Pope the moralist, nay, even (as some have thought of him) Pope the Devil, and, master and servant of them all, Pope the model of 'correct' versification and faultless style,—*that* man has been a familiar figure in literary history for two hundred years. What now is slowly emerging from this collective and intensive study of the news-sheets, miscellanies, journals, correspondence, pamphlets and manuscripts of the period, is that he also had a predisposition for sheer irresponsible fun, which in different circumstances, or under physical handicaps less embittering, would have justified yet another epithet—Pope the clown! He of course allowed no hint of that side of his character to stain the classic perfection of *The Works*—which is perhaps understandable, considering his early training. Nevertheless, such delicious absurdities as, for example, *A Farewell to London*, *The Court Ballad*, *Sandys' Ghost*, and *Lines on Swift's Ancestors*, whenever or however they crept into the immortal canon, could only delight his readers. At the same time it should be remembered that Pope never acknowledged writing those poems, and that two of them were not printed till long after his death. The same mystery of concealed authorship surrounds his other pieces of the kind, which have been, or are being, rescued one by one from oblivion: similarly unsponsored on publication, they were one and all afterwards neglected—a few even repudiated—by their author. Psychologically, they probably represent Pope's unconscious rebellion from time to time against the daily strain of such tremendous poetical tasks as the great Homer translations and the long major works. This, then, is the story of the discovery—or, rather, identification—of what may prove to be yet one more of these 'unofficial' poems of Pope's.

On 4 October 1732 a little-known anonymous poem, whose title is conveniently shortened to *Verses On England's Arch-Poet*, was published attacking Sir Richard Blackmore, physician to William III and (what has more to do with the poem) writer of interminable epics. From the poetical point of view the lampoon is not perhaps of the first importance; yet, besides being interesting in itself as a neglected illustration of



the quarrels of authors, it is, as hinted above, still more interesting as a probable 'new' work by the author of *The Dunciad*. The piece was first printed in the so-called 'Third Volume' (chronologically the fourth) of Swift and Pope's *Miscellanies*; and for many years afterwards appeared only in the various editions and rearrangements of them, always without attribution. The 1732 text with the original footnotes runs as follows:

## V E R S E S

*To be placed under the Picture of  
England's Arch-Poet: Containing  
a compleat Catalogue of his Works.*

SEE who ne'er was or will be half read!  
Who first sung <sup>1</sup>*Arthur*, then sung <sup>2</sup>*Alfred*,  
Prais'd great <sup>3</sup>*Eliza* in God's anger,  
Till all true *Englishmen* cry'd, hang her!  
Made *William's* Virtues wipe the bare A——  
And hang'd up *Marlborough* in <sup>4</sup>*Arras*:

Then hiss'd from Earth, grew Heav'nly quite;  
Made ev'ry Reader curse the <sup>5</sup>*Light*;  
Maul'd human *Wit* in one thick <sup>6</sup>*Satyr*,  
Next in three Books, sunk <sup>7</sup>human *Nature*,  
Un-did <sup>8</sup>*Creation* at a Jerk,  
And of <sup>9</sup>*Redemption* made damn'd Work.

Then took his Muse at once, and dipt her  
Full in the middle of the Scripture.  
What Wonders there the Man grown old, did?  
*Sternhold* himself he out-*Sternholded*,  
Made <sup>10</sup>*David* seem so mad and freakish,  
All thought him just what thought King *Achiz*.

No Mortal read his <sup>11</sup>*Salomon*,  
But judg'd *Roboam* his own Son.  
*Moses*<sup>12</sup> he serv'd as *Moses Pharaoh*,  
And *Deborah*, as She *Sise-rah*:  
Made <sup>13</sup>*Jeremy* full sore to cry,  
And <sup>14</sup>*Job* himself curse God and die.

<sup>1</sup> Two Heroick Poems in Folio, twenty Books.

<sup>2</sup> Heroick Poem in twelve Books.

<sup>3</sup> Heroick Poem in Folio, ten Books.

<sup>4</sup> Instructions to *Vanderbank* a Tapestry-Weaver.

<sup>5</sup> Hymn to the Light.

<sup>6</sup> Satyr against *Wit*.

<sup>7</sup> Of the *Nature* of Man.

<sup>8</sup> *Creation*, a Poem in seven Books.

<sup>9</sup> The *Redeemer*, another Heroick Poem in six Books.

<sup>10</sup> Translation of all the *Psalms*.

<sup>11</sup> *Canticles* and *Ecclesiast*.

<sup>12</sup> Paraphrase of the Canticles of *Moses* and *Deborah*, &c.

<sup>13</sup> The *Lamentations*.

<sup>14</sup> The whole book of *Job*, a Poem in Folio.

What Punishment all this must follow?  
 Shall *Arthur* use him like King *Tollo*,  
 Shall *David* as *Uriah* slay him,  
 Or dext'rous *Deb'rah* *Sisera*-him?  
 Or shall *Eliza* lay a Plot,  
 To treat him like her Sister *Scot*,  
 Shall *William* dub his better *End*\*  
 Or *Marlb'rough* serve him like a Friend?  
 No, none of these—Heav'n spare his Life!  
 But send him, honest *Job*, thy *Wife*.

\* Kick him on the Breech, not Knight him on the Shoulder.

The poem remained unclaimed and unscribed until 1773, in which year it was included, quite arbitrarily and without comment, amongst the works of John Gay in Bell's edition of the poets, the editor of which (we have recently been told) 'had no special clue, denied to other editors, to help him'.<sup>1</sup> Later, most of the imitators of Bell's *British Poets* also followed Bell in giving the *Verses* to Gay, again without evidence; and J. Underhill made the same unsupported attribution in 1893 (reprinted 1905).<sup>2</sup> Next, Gay's latest and best editor, Mr. G. C. Faber, excluded it from the canon in 1926, both because of the lack of any reason for including it, and because it 'is not at all in Gay's manner'.<sup>3</sup> Since then, however, Gay's authorship of the piece has been reasserted by Dr. G. Sherburn,<sup>4</sup> who, following Elwin and Courthope's lead,<sup>5</sup> gives the poem to Gay on the sole evidence of Pope's letter to Jervas in Ireland, dated 14 November 1716, the third paragraph of which runs—

Gay is yours and theirs [Dean Swift and Dr. Parnell's]. His spirit is awakened very much in the cause of the dean, which has broke forth in a courageous couplet or two upon Sir Richard Blackmore. He has printed it with his name to it, and bravely assigns no other reason, than that the said Sir Richard has abused Dr. Swift.<sup>6</sup> I have also suffered in the like cause, and shall suffer more. . . .

It is this 'couplet or two' attacking Blackmore, which Mr. Sherburn and his predecessors identify with the poem, *Verses on England's Arch-Poet*, forgetting that even in its title it purports to give 'a compleat Catalogue' of Blackmore's works, and in the text explicitly names at least three major poems which had not been written or published at the date of Pope's letter, or for several years later. There is no reason whatever to suppose that *Verses* was either published before 1732, or printed 'with Gay's name

<sup>1</sup> Gay's *Poetical Works*, ed. G. C. Faber, 1926, p. xxv.

<sup>2</sup> Gay's *Poetical Works*, ed. J. Underhill, 1893 (Muses' Lib.).

<sup>3</sup> G. C. Faber, *op. cit.*, p. xxv.

<sup>4</sup> *The Early Career of Alexander Pope*, 1934, p. 167.

<sup>5</sup> *Pope's Works*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, VIII, 1872, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> That is, in Blackmore's *Essays*, in which Swift is called, amongst other things, 'this impious Buffoon' (p. 217). This volume was published by Curll on 8 March 1716, according to *The Post Boy* of 6-8 March, and other papers of that date.

to it' earlier than 1773. Final proof is reached, of course, with the correct identification of the then recently published poem to which Pope alluded. This is without doubt *An Epistle to the Right Honourable the Earl of Burlington*. By Mr. Gay, more easily recognizable perhaps under its subtitle, *A Journey to Exeter*. Here Gay's 'courageous' but elusive 'couplet or two' attacking Blackmore appear in the concluding paragraph, at the point where the travellers, approaching their journey's end, alight at an inn—

Upon whose Sign this courteous Motto stands :

*This is the ancient Hand, and eke the Pen;*

*Here is for Horses Hay, and Meat for Men.*

Upon which Gay breaks his narrative and proceeds to deploy an attack on Blackmore (and, incidentally, on Ambrose Philips too, in lines 135-140) in these words :

How Rhyme would flourish, did each Son of Fame 127

Know his own Genius, and direct his Flame!

Then he, that could not Epic Flights rehearse,

Might sweetly mourn in Elegiac Verse. 130

But were his Muse for Elegy unfit,

Perhaps a Distich might not strain his Wit;

If Epigram offend, his harmless Lines

Might in gold Letters swing on Ale-house signs.

Then *Hobbinol* might propagate his Bays, 135

And *Tuttle-fields* record his simple Lays;

Where Rhymes like these might lure the Nurses Eyes,

While gaping Infants squawl for farthing Pies :

*Treat here, ye Shepherds blithe, your Damsels sweet,*

*For Pies and Cheesecakes are for Damsels meet.* 140

Then *Maurus* in his proper Sphere might shine,

And these proud numbers grace great *William's* sign :

*\*This is the Man, this the Nassovian, whom*

*I nam'd the brave Deliverer to come.* 144

The poem then ends with four more lines of narrative, telling of the arrival at Exeter. *Maurus*, it will be remembered, was Dryden's name for Blackmore in the epistle *To my Honoured Kinsman, John Driden*, and also in the Prologue to *The Secular Masque*. But Gay, as though to leave no doubt about the personality of *Maurus*, actually quotes the last couplet (ll. 143-4) from one of Sir Richard's best known epics, and adds a footnote, thus: \*Prince Arthur, *Book 5*. (The reference to 'great William' is, of course, to William III, who was thus to be posthumously rewarded by Blackmore for knighting him in 1697.)

This *Epistle* of Gay's must have been first published in 1716; for although the journey it commemorates was made in the summer of 1715,<sup>1</sup> and the narrative itself in all probability sketched out shortly afterwards,

<sup>1</sup> G. C. Faber, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvi.

Pope's letter proves that the text, as we know it, was printed at some date *after* the publication of Blackmore's abuse of the Dean on 8 March 1716, and *before* 14 November 1716, when the letter was written. Confirmation is seen in Lintot's accounts,<sup>1</sup> whose practice it was to pay his authors shortly before publication; for these show that he paid Gay £10 15s. for the 'Epistle to the Earl of Burlington' at some time between 22 December 1715 and 4 May 1717, the immediate dates of other settlements with him. Thus as the eighteen lines, above quoted, read like an interpolation, being quite unlike and unconnected with anything else in the poem, and as they break the narrative flow only four lines before the end, it is highly probable that Gay's attack on Blackmore was an eleventh hour insertion in a more or less completely narrative poem. The oldest surviving edition of Gay's *Epistle to Burlington* was published together with 'The Fifth Edition' of his earlier *Epistle to a Lady*, in an undated pamphlet entitled *Two Epistles*; but whether it was the first edition, or not, is another matter, and cannot be argued in this place.<sup>2</sup>

Though the claim for Gay's authorship of *Verses on England's Arch-Poet*, based on Pope's letter to Jervas, can no longer be maintained, the poem might still perhaps be speculatively attributed to him as a friend of Pope and Swift, and a known contributor to the earlier volumes of their *Miscellanies*; on this point too, therefore, a word must be said. The published correspondence of Pope and Swift makes it quite certain that the final volume of their *Miscellanies* (which was suggested and compiled by Pope alone) consisted mostly of Swift's work. On 4 November 1732, the Dean wrote to Motte,<sup>3</sup> saying that 'almost six-sevenths of the whole verse part in the book' was his, and he later claimed a slightly higher proportion.<sup>4</sup> Pope, in his 'Advertisement', speaking of the contents of the whole book, prose and verse, says: 'There are in this Volume, as in the former, one or two small pieces by other Hands',—other, that is, than his and Swift's, in whose names the whole set was produced. Little more than two months before the book was published, Gay, writing from Amesbury, where he was staying with the Duke and Duchess of Queensberry, to Swift in Ireland (24 July 1732),<sup>5</sup> tells him of a piece of news he had obviously only just heard: 'Last post I had a letter from Mr. Pope, who informs me he hath heard from you and that he is preparing some scattered things of yours and his for the press. I believe I shall not see him till the winter . . .'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, VIII, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> The Bodleian copy of *Two Epistles*, for example, ends with two leaves of book advertisements, which appear to date from 1720. They may, of course, have been added, in 1720, to unsold copies of the pamphlet; for whether the pamphlet was printed in 1716 or not, it is undated, and would therefore still be saleable as a new book in 1720.

<sup>3</sup> *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. F. E. Ball, IV, p. 360.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 367.

<sup>5</sup> Swift's *Correspondence*, ed. cit., IV, p. 325.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 325.

As Gay made no further allusion to Pope's forthcoming anthology, it is clear from these words that he had neither made, nor thought to make, any contribution to this last volume of *Miscellanies*; and, in consequence, his authorship of *Verses* can henceforth be completely and finally dismissed.

Now, apart from Swift and Pope, no author is known to have written any poem in the verse section of the 1732 volume of *Miscellanies*; and there are no grounds for thinking the 'one or two' other hands present were not limited to those stated elsewhere by Pope himself as having collaborated with him in the *Origine of Sciences*<sup>1</sup> (and, maybe, some other of the prose items with which the book begins), namely Arbuthnot and Parnell. Whatever may be known about Arbuthnot's prose writings, there are not more than two or three poems extant which can with certainty be called his. The consequence is that his verse cannot be recognized by any characteristic style. And even if it were as correct as it is customary to attribute to him, wholly or in part, every anonymous poem dealing with scientific or medical subjects, which emanated from that small group of intimates known as the Scriblerus Club,<sup>2</sup> he still could not be credited with any poem in this volume, because it contains none of that kind. It would seem, therefore, that Mr. Faber's tentative suggestion,<sup>3</sup> that the *Verses* may have been written by Arbuthnot, is very far from probable, especially as the only evidence he could produce was one small joke against Blackmore, which Arbuthnot made in a letter to Swift (11 December 1718), to the effect that Sir Richard's Pegasus needed no spurring.<sup>4</sup> There is, moreover, no evidence on record of any real ill-feeling between the two doctors, Arbuthnot and Blackmore, much less a quarrel of the bitterness which the poem postulates, and of which (one would think) it could hardly be the sole expression; and there is nothing else even seeming to connect Arbuthnot with the *Verses*. As for Parnell, whatever other contributions of his may appear in the volume—and they must be exiguous in the extreme—he certainly had nothing to do with this attack on Blackmore, because several of the epics it mentions were not written till years after his death in 1718.

There is, however, a little more information available about the poetical section of the 1732 volume of *Miscellanies*. Pope's correspondence<sup>5</sup> shows that he was directly concerned with the edition of *Miscellanies*. In *Four Volumes* (published 3 July 1742) in which the original four *Miscellanies* were for the most part reprinted, with much rearrangement of matter, some revision of text, and 'several additional pieces'. The verse, for

<sup>1</sup> J. Spence, *Anecdotes*, ed. S. W. Singer, p. 201.

<sup>2</sup> The regular members were Pope, Swift, Gay, Arbuthnot and Parnell.

<sup>3</sup> G. C. Faber, *op. cit.*, p. xxv.

<sup>4</sup> Swift's *Correspondence*, ed. *cit.*, III, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Elwin and Courthope, ed. *cit.*, IX, pp. 531 ff.

example, is now collected in one volume, the fourth, which reveals that Pope suppressed one of his own pieces formerly included, and included two others of his, one never before printed and the other dating only from the preceding year. And in this volume Swift's pieces are for the first time indicated by marking with an asterisk, both in the text and the 'Contents';<sup>1</sup> all the poems which were written by *other* people; a feature which was repeated in subsequent editions. As in no case have these indications been proved wrong, they may be taken as generally correct; though that is not to say that Swift may not have collaborated in a few of the starred pieces. Some light is therefore reflected back on those poems in the 1732 volume which reappeared in the 1742 edition. Thus, as *Verses on England's Arch-Poet* is starred both in the text and 'Contents', it may safely be assumed it was *not* written by Swift—an assumption with which his latest editor, Mr. Harold Williams, evidently agrees, seeing that, like all his predecessors, he excludes it from the canon. So much, then, for Gay, Arbuthnot, Parnell and Swift: remains Pope.

The case for Pope's authorship of the *Verses* attacking Blackmore is based first of all on a number of general arguments which can be briefly stated thus: (a) Pope was the prime and sole mover in the production of the last of his and Swift's *Miscellanies*; he proposed the scheme, collected the material, edited and published it, and is the only person known to have had this poem in his hands; (b) all his life Pope was in the habit of including numbers of his own anonymous pieces (prose as well as verse) in anthologies of his editing,<sup>2</sup> and very frequently would have nothing more to do with such pieces afterwards; (c) someone within a very small circle must have written the *Verses*; but, as shown above, all its members can be eliminated as possible candidates for authorship except Pope. These arguments, however, do not stand alone, but are corroborated by the witness of opportunity (as seen in his editorship of the volume), motive, occasion and character; not to mention a certain amount of internal evidence, presently to be discussed.

The first fact of significance to claim consideration is the existence of a long-standing quarrel between Pope and Blackmore, with its sorry but not unamusing tale of attack and counter-attack, in which Pope was assailed on religious, and Blackmore on literary, grounds. As early as the *Essay on Criticism*, 1711, Pope, youthfully indignant at Blackmore's attacks on Dryden in *A Satyr against Wit* and elsewhere, had cited him as one of the crowd of envious detractors which a great man has always to contend with;

<sup>1</sup> The note on the 'Contents' page reads: 'N.B. Whatever are not mark'd with a Star are Dr. Swift's.'

<sup>2</sup> Different anthologies, or editions each varying from the previous one, which Pope is known to have edited, and in which he included anonymous work of his own, were published in 1712, 1714, 1717, 1720, 1722, 1726, 1727, 1728, and 1732.



and, after speaking of what Dryden had to endure in his lifetime from such people, went on—

Might he return, and bless once more our Eyes,  
New Blackmores and new Milbournes must arise.

In which he coupled another name with Blackmore's (the Reverend Luke Milbourn had offensively criticised Dryden's *Virgil*) as his master had done more than once before him.<sup>1</sup> When the couplet was first published in 1711, Sir Richard's name was only hinted at, thus, 'New *Bl*—s'; but in the second edition and for several years later Pope altered this to 'New *S*—s' (Shadwells), presumably because he and Blackmore had become acquainted about that time. So at least it would appear, seeing that by 19 April 1714 Pope was sending his 'humble service' to Sir Richard by a mutual friend, John Hughes.<sup>2</sup> In any case, down to 1716 Pope's complaint against Blackmore seems to have been little more than academic. But with Sir Richard's abuse of Swift above mentioned (8 March 1716), Pope became incensed enough to make a personal matter of it, as his letter shows; and within about three weeks had begun to make public fun of the pompous old poet. His earliest witticisms about him are to be found in the first of the famous 'Emetic' lampoons on Curll, which appeared on or about 29 March (it should not be forgotten that in addition to Curll's offences against Pope, he was also the publisher of Blackmore's attack on Swift); and that was followed by the second lampoon about the end of November, in which the baiting of Blackmore assumes almost the proportions of a major theme.<sup>3</sup> Between the first and second lampoons, however, Curll in revenge had piratically published Pope's regrettable *Version of the First Psalm*; and the whole quarrel finally boiled over when Sir Richard, in a second volume of *Essays* (published 26 March 1717), railed against 'the godless author [who] has burlesqu'd the First Psalm of David in so obscene and profane a manner'. Pope, who had never meant the skit for publication, and was already more than a little ashamed of it, or rather of the misconstruction<sup>4</sup> almost universally placed on it, never forgot or forgave him. Three months later, Blackmore's name reappeared at full length in the *Essay on Criticism* in the collected *Works*, 3 June 1717.

In the meantime, Arbuthnot writing to Swift (26 June 1714) had reported that 'Pope has been collecting high flights of poetry, which are very good; they are to be solemn nonsense'<sup>5</sup>—which was doubtless the beginnings of *The Art of Sinking*, one of the projects discussed by the

<sup>1</sup> 'Trust Maurus with thy life, and Milbourn with thy soul'—*To my Honoured Kinsman, John Dryden* (ll. 86–87); and 'Blackmore and Milbourn are only distinguished . . . by being remembered to their infamy'—Preface to *Fables*.

<sup>2</sup> Elwin and Courthope, *ed. cit.*, X, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Both lampoons are discussed in Pope's *Prose Works*, I, ed. N. Ault, pp. xciv ff.

<sup>4</sup> N. Ault, 'New Light on Pope', *R.E.S.*, October 1942, pp. 441–7.

<sup>5</sup> Swift's *Correspondence*, *ed. cit.*, II, p. 160.

Scriblerus Club about this time, and left undeveloped. Pope afterwards added to these 'high flights', carried the work through, and published it early in 1728. And it is scarcely any exaggeration to say that in *The Art of Sinking* scores of lines from Blackmore's interminable epics are quoted to illustrate every possible literary lapse and every ridiculous aspect imaginable of the 'Profund'; the 'great Author', Sir Richard himself, being promoted 'father of the Bathos, and indeed the Homer of it'.

Ten weeks later came *The Dunciad* (18 May) in which Blackmore's 'endless line' is squinted at in Book I, while in Book II, besides a couple of other scoffing references to him, he has ten searing lines all to himself: Pope is describing the Public Games consequent on the enthronement of King Dunc, and thus announces the winner in the competition of the *Brayers*:

But far o'er all sonorous Bl[ackmore]'s strain, 235  
Walls, steeples, skies, bray back to him again:  
In Tot'nham fields, the brethren with amaze  
Prick all their ears up, and forget to graze;  
Long Chanc'ry-lane retentive rolls the sound,  
And courts to courts return it round and round; 240  
Thames wafts it thence to Rufus' roaring hall,  
And H[ungerfor]d re-echoes, bawl for bawl.  
All hail him victor in both gifts of Song,  
Who sings so loudly, and who sings so long. 244

To the last line just quoted Pope later added a lengthy footnote, which, because it is virtually a prose counterpart of the *Verses*, and has the same peculiar insistence on the number of the 'Books' in each of Blackmore's epics as is shown in the footnotes to the *Verses* (see above p. 377), is of real importance to the present argument. It runs as follows:

'A just character of Sir Richard Blackmore, Kt. . . . whose indefatigable Muse produced no less than six Epic poems: Prince and King Arthur, 20 Books; Eliza 10; Alfred 12; The Redeemer 6, besides Job in folio, the whole Book of Psalms, The Creation, 7 Books, Nature of Man, 3 Books, and many more. 'Tis in this sense he is stiled afterwards, the *Everlasting Blackmore*. . .'

When to all this are added Pope's sneers at him in at least four of the *Imitations of Horace*, and one or two other allusions in other places, it is obvious that the *Verses* fits more neatly and convincingly into the Pope-Blackmore feud than into any other contemporary setting; which setting, moreover, would also have to be such as would allow Pope to know of the poem in MS., and be the first to print it. It should also be remembered that in 1732 Blackmore had been dead three years; and though Pope may have been willing to publish one of his old pieces on the old theme, it does not at all follow that he would have included such untropical matter from anyone outside what may be called the 'Miscellanies' circle; and all the others within it have previously been discounted.

The poem itself looks like another of Pope's high-spirited, irresponsible effusions in which he indulged his wildest fancy, or gave free rein to his peculiar humour, from time to time. For besides being cast in a favourite metre, it has the characteristic acrobatic rhymes and the old impolite words found in so many of his 'unofficial' pieces, while between the lines of the easiest-going verse the scathing ridicule of his subject drives pitilessly on as usual to end with overwhelming effect. In particular, the rhymes seem to have been struck in the same mint that coined such pairs as: conundrum—grows und'r 'em; step some—Epsom; rump yet—strumpet; Miles Davies—vous-avez; the news saw—Ragusa, and scores of others as intentionally absurd and bizarre scattered throughout Pope's lighter pieces. Indeed, it is difficult to think of anyone at that time (except possibly Swift) as lavish of versified absurdities as was Pope, the most correct poet in Christendom! But neither the grimmer Swift nor the lighter-hearted Gay (even if they had been possible candidates in this case) played the clown in just Pope's manner or to anything like the same extent.

Again, amongst Pope's 'bad poets', and one of his frequent butts though of an earlier century than Blackmore, was Thomas Sternhold, the Elizabethan versifier of the Psalms;<sup>1</sup> and here in *Verses* it would appear to be Pope, who, by making Blackmore out-Sternhold Sternhold, kills two birds with one stone and his accustomed neatness and thrift. It would appear to be Pope also because none of his contemporaries worried themselves about Sternhold and Hopkins at that period: only Pope's supersensitive ear for correctness of versification and his genuine love of his craft kept him scornful and intolerant of poor writing all his life. Lastly, the joke about the use of an author's works for toilet purposes was an old one with Pope, who had printed it as early as 1712, toyed with it again in 1716, and was to make use of it once more as late as *circa* 1740 in a couplet which has not yet been published.

The cumulative effect of all the foregoing probabilities may carry—if not conviction—at least justification for the inclusion of *Verses on England's Arch-Poet* amongst the attributed poems in the Pope canon. The piece was obviously written between 1723, the date of Sir Richard's last poem, *Alfred*, and 1729, the year of his death. It may therefore be provisionally dated 1727, the year in which Pope quoted him so extensively in *The Art of Sinking*.

<sup>1</sup> Pope's caricature of Sternhold's style in the First Psalm was discussed by the present writer in the article, 'New Light on Pope', above mentioned; *R.E.S.* October 1942.

# VARIANTS IN THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE POEMS OF RUPERT BROOKE AND A. E. HOUSMAN

BY MAURICE PLATNAUER

## I

Some years ago I was enabled through the kindness of (the late) Mrs. Brooke and the Librarian of King's College, Cambridge, to examine the manuscripts of Rupert Brooke's poems. King's College library owned at the time only the little black note-book in which 'Grantchester' was composed. Since then Sir Edward Marsh has handed over to its keeping the large leather-bound volume into which he had collected the manuscripts of most, if not of all, of the other poems. It is to his kindness, and to that of Rupert Brooke's literary executors, Dr. J. T. Sheppard, Provost of King's, and Dr. Geoffrey Keynes, that I owe the permission to publish the Brooke variants.

The manuscripts vary considerably in their state of completion. Some, notably those of 'Grantchester' and the war sonnets, are obviously rough sketches only, others, e.g. 'Retrospect' and 'Tiare Tahiti', scarcely differ from the published version. It is not to be supposed (except in a very few cases which I have mentioned) that the variants here given have any authority as against the printed editions; they are merely 'first thoughts' subsequently altered by the poet. In some cases there exists, besides the rough version, a fair copy; but I doubt whether in any case these manuscripts exhibit a poem in the form in which it went to press.

I should perhaps in honesty emphasize the fact that many years separate my inspection of the originals and my writing of this article. A faulty reading of my own notes is possible but my conscience does not prick me.

I have used the Collected Edition (Sidgwick and Jackson, 1929) and have given its readings in the left-hand column; those of the manuscript in the right.

### 'Dust' (p. 42).

|       |                          |                               |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| l. 12 | About                    | Around                        |
| l. 13 | And every mote, on earth | And scattering still on earth |
| l. 20 | Shall meet               | Will meet                     |

['Will' appears not only in the rough draft but also in the fair copy. How 'shall' got in I do not know. It is a pity that it did, for it is bad grammar.]

|       |                                     |                                  |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| l. 26 | So high a beauty                    | So high a glory                  |
| l. 31 | Singing, or flame, or scent, or hue | Singing or flame or flame or hue |

- l. 34 But in that instant But in that moment  
 l. 35 Both in rough draft and fair copy 'our' is underlined. In future editions the word might well be italicized.

## 'Kindliness' (p. 44).

This seems to be the fair copy. The only change is that where the published version has (l. 22) 'down other windier skies' the manuscript has 'down other-windier-skies'.

## 'Mummia' (p. 46).

- l. 5 Drunk on the dead Drunk with the dead  
 'Ambarvalia' (p. 60).  
 l. 18 Thunders, and dark is here Thunders and night is here

## 'Town and Country' (p. 65).

- l. 3 more intimate meanings most intimate meanings  
 l. 9 Here the green-purple clanging Here the imperial green and royal night purple night

## 'Menelaus and Helen' (p. 68).

This poem in the rough copy starts:

They say when Troy was taken through the (?) dead  
 And a king's honour in one blow. He sped

- l. 8 flaming like a god splendid (v.l. conquering) as a flame

[This implies a different rhyme at l. 5 of which there is no trace.]

- l. 12 'tired' has a *marginale*, 'sick'.

Part II starts:

So far Romance goes; Poesy knows no more.  
 It follows not the victor fleet nor sees  
 That journey home

- l. 6 waxed garrulous grew garrulous

## 'Lust' (p. 70).

The old title 'Libido' is found, corrected, in the fair copy. The rough draft has a pencil sketch of the 'dead man on a bed'. [I learn from Sir Edward Marsh that 'Rupert Brooke was furious with the publishers for making him change the title' and that 'whenever he came across a copy of the book in a friend's house he would change it back'.]

In the rough copy the poem starts:

How could I know? The enormous wheel of lust  
 Drove me cold eyed and tired and sleepless on

[The end of l. 1 has a v.l. The image of your (?) kiss.]

- l. 5 As never fool for love As never king for gold  
 l. 9 hot wrist shiver strange hand shiver  
 l. 10 mad victory mad paradise

- l. 11 in your burning bending head and head was held to burning  
head  
l. 12 conqueror's has the v. ll. conquering, anxious, triumphing  
deep river deep stream  
[Implying change of rhyme at l. 9 of which there is no trace.]

## 'Grantchester' (p. 93).

The poem's first title was 'Home'. This was erased and 'The Sentimental Exile' substituted.

- l. 4 smile the carnation bloom the carnation  
After l. 6 (all the lines in the manuscript are numbered) the poem goes straight on to (the published) l. 59 (And spectral dance, before the dawn). In the manuscript 'ghostly' (for 'spectral') appears.

- l. 60 down the lawn 'cross the lawn  
After the present line 68 (. . . sleeper out) the manuscript goes back to the present l. 49 (Still in the dawn-lit . . . )

After the present l. 50 (. . . his pool) comes l. 53 (Dan Chaucer . . . ).

- After the present l. 56 (. . . hurry by) the manuscript goes on to the present l. 115 (Ah God! to see . . . )

- l. 56 How Cambridge waters How Cambridge rivers  
ll. 133-4 And laughs the immortal river still And is the river running still  
Under the mill, under the mill? Beneath the mill, beneath the mill?

[This couplet is not fitted into the poem in the rough copy but appears by itself together with a few other odd couplets including the final one.]

The manuscript now returns to the present l. 7 (Oh! there the chestnuts . . . )

- l. 12 Green as a dream Dark as a dream  
l. 20 Lean up to embrace Laugh up to embrace  
l. 23 beneath a morn of gold beneath an orange morn

[No trace of changed rhyme in l. 24.]

- l. 24 tulips bloom tulips grow  
l. 32 Where *das Betreten's* not *verboden*. That are not *Polizei verboten*.

After the present l. 34 (In Grantchester . . . ) comes, in the manuscript, an unfinished couplet:

Some other now that is not I  
May or lie

after which the poem proceeds with the present l. 35 (Some, it may be . . . )

- l. 38 A Faun a-peeping A Dryad peeping  
l. 43 that you may lie that when you lie

After the first word of l. 49 (Still . . . ) the manuscript breaks off and continues with ll. 57-8 (And in that garden . . . all night). After this comes l. 71 (God! I will pack . . . ) and continues as in the printed version to l. 78.

- l. 77 And of *that* district And of that (?) England

Then follow ll. 131-end (Oh, is the water . . . ). [This is written at the foot of a page and upside down.]



Overleaf occur ll. 115-130 (Ah God! to see . . . about the corn). Next follows the 'Cambridgeshire section', ll. 79-114 (For Cambridge people . . . shoot themselves, I'm told). In this section there are some slight varieties in the order of the couplets, and in the margin is jotted down a list of villages. The couplet ll. 93-4 has a question mark.

l. 102      And men and women      Tall men and women

After l. IIII (. . . worship Truth) is scribbled as a *marginal*:

And so at general elections  
They have the strength of their convictions  
The atheists\* vote liberal  
And many do not vote at all.

[\*‘The atheists’ is written over ‘Twenty per cent’.]

This gives the order of composition (so far as it can be made out): 1-6: 59-68: 49-50: 53-56: 115-132: 7-48: 57-58: 71-78: 131-end: 115-130 (*bis*): 79-114. The couplets 51-52 and 69-70 come in with the odd couplets mentioned above.

'Beauty and Beauty' (p. 101).

1. 6      With soft and drunken      With low and drunken

'Mary and Gabriel' (p. 103).

[illegible]

1. 2      Felt a warm splendour      Felt a rich splendour

1. 7 Baring the eager marble      Baring the keen perfection

In place of ll. 8, q come four lines:

Gold raiment hid the undying body's grace  
With beauty not of man or woman fair . . .  
Nor man's nor woman's that undying grace  
That curved the limbs . . . drapery gold

|          |   |                                  |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| l. 13    | He told his word                            | He gave his word                 |
| l. 15    | half long had known                         | half knew before                 |
| l. 30    | Her hands crept up                          | One hand crept up                |
| ll. 23-4 | With eyes / Closed                          | Her eyes / Closed                |
| l. 26    | She wished to speak                         | She would have spoken            |
| l. 28    | And throbs not understood                   | And pangs not understood         |
| l. 32    | dare not think, swift thoughts<br>and dumb, | dare not think, her extasy,      |
| l. 35    | Her heart was faint for telling             | Her heart was faint for sympathy |
| l. 37    | whispering, half revealing                  | whispering, not telling          |

Ll. 41-3 appear in the rough draft as:

He knelt unmoved, radiant, calm (?) gold and wise  
Untroubled in his wisdom, kind, serene.

['deathless' and 'sexless' appear, erased.]

ll. 45-6 How would she, pitiful with mor- She could not from her poor  
tality, mortality  
Try the wide peace Shake the wide peace

- |       |                              |                             |
|-------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| l. 47 | perplexed shaken heart       | shaken, tender heart        |
| l. 53 | glory on the fields          | glory on the air            |
| l. 57 | The air was colder, and grey | The air was grey and colder |

‘The Busy Heart’ (p. 107).

No title in the manuscript, which is one of the most confused of them all.

- |       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
| l. 2  | I would fill my mind with thoughts            | I would fill my heart with                         |
|       | that will not rend                            | thoughts that do not rend                          |
| l. 7  | And babes that weep and so forget             | Babies that cry and then forget                    |
|       | their weeping                                 | their crying                                       |
| l. 9  | And evening hush, broken by hom-<br>ing wings | And eve’s recurrent murmur of<br>homing wings      |
|       |   | [v.l. (1) And even’s hush (2) The<br>hush of even] |
| l. 10 | And Song’s nobility, and Wisdom<br>holy       | And Wisdom’s nobleness and<br>teaching holy        |
|       |   | [v.l. . . . and song that’s holy]                  |

‘Love’ (p. 108).

- |       |                  |                   |
|-------|------------------|-------------------|
| l. 4  | who love unloved | who loved unloved |
| l. 10 | but they know    | but these know    |

‘The Chilterns’ (p. 109).

- |       |                                  |                                 |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| l. 6  | Thank God, that’s done! and I’ll | So fare you well! I’ll take the |
|       | take the road                    | road                            |
| l. 8  | The Roman road to Wendover       | The Roman way to Andover        |
| l. 15 | Even Love goes past              | Love itself goes past           |
| l. 20 | I may not meet again             | I shall not get again           |
| l. 28 | The autumn road                  | The lonely road                 |
| l. 38 | as wise, but kindlier            | as wise but tenderer            |

‘Home’ (p. 111).

- l. 9 The published version: ‘The form of one I did not know’ is *corrected* in the manuscript to ‘A woman’s form I did not know’.

‘The Night Journey’ (p. 112).

Another very confused manuscript, especially the third stanza.

- |       |  |                       |
|-------|--|-----------------------|
| l. 2  | The dazed last minutes click   | The minute ticks away |
| l. 9  | As a man, caught   | As a man finding love |
| l. 11 | ‘sightless’, which is found in the published version, was in the manuscript erased. The end of the line was left as: |                       |
|       | with blind blank staring eyes.   |                       |

- l. 21 Again the ‘far-blowing’ of the printed version appears as ‘fantastic’, with ‘? ? swift, livid’ scribbled above.

- |       |                                   |                                 |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| l. 24 | The white lights roar. The sounds | Speed grows and grows. Fate (?) |
|       | of the world die.                 | grows with the roaring wheels.  |

‘The Way that Lovers use’ (p. 114).

Written on a postcard addressed to Edward (now Sir Edward) Marsh, dated 6 May 1913. It bears the comment ‘not good’.

- l. 5 They queerly find some healing so Sure they must find some heal-  
ing so  
l. 9 And theirs no longer joy nor smart Tears are no more nor joy nor  
smart  
l. 10 Changing or . . . or . . . Changing nor . . . nor . . .

'The Funeral of Youth' (p. 115).

- l. 5 Who had lived the boon compan- Who had eaten and drunk with  
ions of his prime him that happy time  
l. 7 many-crown'd carouse violet-crowned carouse  
l. 14 Follow'd their old friend's bier Followed Youth's funeral bier  
l. 17 And after trod the bearers And after came the pall men  
l. 18 Captain *Pride* Colonel *Pride*  
l. 20 Who had to catch a train Ever looking at his watch

'Mutability' (p. 119).

Has the *marginale*: 'Call it *aeterna corpora*, if you think best'.

'Sonnet' (*Suggested by some of the Proceedings of the Society for  
Psychical Research*) (p. 121).

This in the manuscript has no title.

- l. 2 We'll beat on the substantial doors We'll beat, when all is done . . .  
unheard on the substantial  
doors  
l. 4 Plaintive for earth; but rather turn Remembering earth. We'll turn,  
and run I think, and run  
l. 6 'Some' of the published version is crossed out and 'On' substituted.  
l. 7 The manuscript gives two variants: (1) Pull down the shadows over  
us and find (2) Stoop under faint gleams, thread the shadows, find

'Waikiki' (p. 124).

- l. 1 Warm perfumes Warm fragrance  
In l. 3 'cries' is queried.  
l. 4 night's brown savagery night's soft savagery  
l. 5 And dark scents whisper; and dim Faint with dark scents. The dim  
waves creep to me waves faint with me (?)\*

[\*Not intended as a whole line.]

In l. 8 'murmurous', 'soft', 'glimmering', 'warm', are all written in the margin  
with the middle two crossed out.

- l. 11 of idleness of foolishness  
l. 13 did evil, foolishly, did evil, one like me,

'Hauntings' (p. 125).

The sestet seems to have been written first.

- l. 9 So a poor ghost, beside his misty So a poor ghost, beside his  
streams shadowy streams  
l. 10 evasive dreams and fugitive dreams  
l. 12 things unintelligible things unimaginable

Then comes the octet, which starts, somewhat formlessly, as follows:

In the gray tumult of these later days  
Sometimes a silence falls, clouds drift apart  
Hush suddenly all the clamour  
The wraith of an old mirth shines out and burns

- l. 8 Comes back the ecstasy of your The ecstasy of your quietude  
quietude returns

'Doubts' (p. 127).

- l. 10 What has laid trouble in her face? What hath laid wisdom in her  
face?

'The Great Lover' (p. 132).

- l. 42 the little dulling edge of foam the little dwindling edge of foam  
l. 53 turn with the traitor breath turn with traitorous breath

'Retrospect' (p. 135).

This, like the last, is a very straightforward manuscript, the only variant being:

- l. 27 without wave or tide without wind or tide

'Tiare Tahiti' (p. 136).

Another manuscript sans corrections except for:

- l. 31 Meet in Loveliness again Turn to Loveliness again

'Safety' (p. 145).

- l. 3 Assured in the dark tides Who has in the dark tides  
l. 4 And heard our word And knew the word  
l. 5 We have found safety with all Our safety we have found with  
things undying immortal things  
l. 10 We have gained a peace We have known a peace  
[There are other *varia*, to me illegible.]

'The Dead' (p. 146).

This poem had originally the alternative titles: (1) 'The Slain'; (2) 'The Slain Speak'.

- l. 2 There's none of these There's none of us  
l. 5 gave up the years to be each gave us the whole earth  
v.l. gave up the things to be  
l. 9 They brought us, for our dearth, They {found} a time of dearth  
{knew}  
l. 10 Holiness, lacked so long To long lacked Holiness

'The Soldier' (p. 148).

There seem to have been (at least) two rough drafts of this. The first contains the variants:

- l. 1 think only this of me think of me only this  
l. 6 Gave, once, her flowers to love Gave once of her flowers to pick  
[pick' corrected to 'love']

- l. 7 A body of England's, breathing Who ate her food, who breathed  
English air an English air
- l. 9 And think, Think, too,
- l. 10 A pulse in the eternal mind, no less An obscure pulse in the eternal  
mind
- l. 11 the thoughts by England given the thoughts that England gave  
The second draft has :
- l. 11 gives back the {thoughts} by  
{store }  
England given
- l. 14 And hearts at peace, under an Eng- And still content beneath an  
lish heaven English heaven  
[v.l. And eyes at peace . . .]

## II

The manuscripts of Housman's *Shropshire Lad* and *Last Poems* are in Cambridge, deposited in, respectively, Trinity College and the Fitzwilliam Museum. Thanks to the courtesy of the Librarian of the former (Mr. H. M. Adams) and the then Director of the latter (Sir Sydney Cockerell), I was enabled to inspect the two manuscripts and to collect variants from them. I have, further, to thank Mr. Laurence Housman for consenting to their publication. These manuscripts are in the state in which they went to press. In certain cases words had been struck out by the poet and others written in above. These changes may be called 'tenth-hour' corrections, being made between the completion of the final draft and the sending of the same to the printer. There are besides this certain words, phrases or even lines which may be seen (unaltered) in the manuscripts but which are not to be found in the printed editions. These changes must have been made by Housman in the printed proofs, and may be called 'eleventh-hour' corrections.

To save space and complication I shall append A to the tenth-hour corrections; B to those of the eleventh. That is to say, that in a line marked A the manuscript originally showed the word or words found below in the right-hand column, with that or those of the left-hand column (=the published text) written in above. Where a line is marked B it means that the word or words in the right-hand column differing from the published text (i.e. the left-hand column) are to be seen only in the manuscript.

*A Shropshire Lad.*

| Poem | Line  |                               |                               |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4    | 5     | A Wake: the vaulted shadow    | Wake: the roof of shadow      |
| 14   | 9, 10 | B His folly has not fellow    | His folly has not fellow      |
|      |       | Beneath the blue of day       | From Thule to Cathay          |
| 15   | 14    | A With downward eye and gazes | With downward eye and bearing |
|      |       | sad,                          | sad,                          |

*A Shropshire Lad.*

- 20 11 A upon the cressy brink upon the rushy brink  
 28 3 B The bridges from the steepled crest The bridges from her steepled crest  
 30 14 B Plays no wind Blows no wind  
 31 3 (=17) B The gate, it plies the saplings The wind, it plies the saplings  
       double, double,  
 32 5, 6 B Now—for a breath I tarry Now, for a breath I tarry  
       Nor yet disperse apart— Nor yet disperse apart,  
 38 9, 10 B Their voices, dying as they fly, Their voices dying as they fly  
       Thick on the wind are sown; Thick on the wind are sown;  
       13 A Oh lads, at home I heard you My lads, at home I heard you  
       plain,  
 18-20 B But neither long-abode; But neither long could stay;  
       Now through the friendless Now through the friendless  
       world we fare world we fare  
       And sigh upon the road. And sigh upon the way.  
 39 12 A That will not shower on me. That shall not shower on me.  
 43 11 A This brain that fills the skull This mind that fills the skull  
       15 B The immortal bones obey con- The immortal bones must  
       trol brook control  
       17 B 'Tis long till eve and morn are 'Tis time that eves and morns  
       gone: were gone:  
       25 A Lie down in the bed of dust; To bed, to bed; lie down in  
       dust;  
 46 12 A Awns the last gleaner Straws the last gleaner  
 50 The opening (italicized) four-line poem does not appear.  
 55 9 A There, when hueless is the There, when ashen is the west  
       west  
 62 13 B Moping melancholy mad: Or drive them melancholy mad:  
 46 B Luck's a chance Good's a chance

*Last Poems.*

- 3 2 A Her towers of fear in wreck Her woven toils in wreck  
 5 8 A And I shall march no more. And I can march no more.  
 30 (The original title in the manuscript is 'Armesünderblume'.)  
       13 A It seemed a herb of healing, It seemed a herb of saining,  
 31 68 A While the hive of hell within While the swarm of hell within  
 34 20 B Stands planted on the dead Stands upright on the dead  
       (with 'upright' struck out  
       and 'lofty' written above)



## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### LEICESTER'S MEN IN THE LOW COUNTRIES

Students of dramatic history are aware of the fact that the account books and municipal archives on which Thomas Sharp based his *Dissertation on the Mysteries anciently performed at Coventry* passed from his hands into the collection of Mr. Staunton of Longbridge House, and from there into the Shakespeare Memorial Library at Birmingham, which was destroyed by fire in 1879.<sup>1</sup> Another manuscript from Longbridge House which suffered the same fate was the Earl of Leicester's household account book for his expedition to the Low Countries in 1585 and 1586. This manuscript was, however, examined by Halliwell-Phillipps while it was still in the possession of Mr. Staunton, and he made a number of extracts from it. Some of these extracts are preserved among his scrapbooks, which are now in the Folger Shakespeare Library. Halliwell-Phillipps had the habit of cutting up anything—old quartos, manuscripts, or notes—and pasting in blank books, according to an arrangement all his own, the scraps he wished to keep; the mutilated remains were presumably discarded or destroyed. The extracts here assembled from several scrapbooks, though few in number, add something to our knowledge of the actors who accompanied Leicester to the Low Countries.

Previous knowledge on the subject is summarized by Sir Edmund Chambers in *The Elizabethan Stage*.<sup>2</sup> He points out that Leicester's men were on tour until the end of August 1585, when Leicester received his commission. 'These may have been either the relics of the old company, or a new one formed to attend the Earl in his expedition.' William Kemp, one of Leicester's servants, arrived at Dunkirk on 15 November, and Leicester himself landed at Flushing on 10 December. Elaborate entertainments were given at the various towns through which Leicester passed, but the first record of a specific play is from Stowe, who records the performance at Utrecht on 23 April 1586 of *The Forces of Hercules*, 'which gave great delight to the strangers'. By the following August Kemp was in Denmark, but it is thought that he had visited England at least once in the meanwhile. Sir Philip Sidney, in a letter of 24 March, mentions 'Will, my lord of Lester's jesting player' as having been the bearer of previous letters to his wife and Walsingham.

The extracts now follow :

<sup>1</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, II, 357.

<sup>2</sup> II, 89-90.

29 December 1585.

Geven in reward to your l. players the same day by your commandment ten poundes . . . . .

x. li.

1 January 1585/6.

To your L. players that go backe into England, for ther charges by your Lo. commandment the same day,

xl. s.

2 Jan<sup>y</sup>. 1585/6.

Your l. gave William Kempe the player therty shillings the same night in your bed chamber out of the ten poundes which I gave your l. for play with Count Moris & my l. of Essex at doble hand lodam which thertye shillings your l. saied was in exchange of a rose noble which was geven him by Count Hollocke,

xxx. s.

4 Jan<sup>y</sup>. 1585/6.

Geven more in reward the same day by your l. commandment to William Kempe the player for his charges into England,

xx. s.

4 March, 1585/6.

Geven in reward the same day by your l. ex. commandment to Wylson that playd at his goinge into England with Sir Thomas Sherley, fortie shillings.

The xvij.th of Aprill. 1586.

Geven in reward at Amersforde the xvij.th of Aprill by your Ex. commaundment to three Duchemen that played before your Ex. in the halle after supper thertie shillings, & to a foole that in the ende of the play came in laughinge with a picture in his hand fyve shillings, the some,

xxxv. s.

6th May, 1586.

To the saied M<sup>r</sup>. Hynde which he gave in reward by your Ex: commaundment to William Kempe after his leaping into a ditche before your Ex: & the Prince Elector as you went a walking at Amersford, fyve shillings

v. s.

It is now clear that a number of Leicester's men, including Kemp, returned to England immediately after the Christmas season, but they were presumably back in the Low Countries in time for the St. George's Day performance at Utrecht, since Kemp was entertaining Leicester with his antics during the first week in May. It is also beyond any doubt that Kemp was the bearer of letters to whom Sidney refers. As one would expect, the Dutch entertained Leicester with plays, but the reference to 'three Duchemen that played' suggests a simpler and more primitive type of interlude than the English actors were accustomed to performing.

The one difficulty in the extracts concerns the payment to Wilson on

4 March 1586. Robert Wilson had been one of Leicester's men until early in 1583, when he joined the Queen's men.<sup>1</sup> In 1585 he received the payment for the plays given at Court by his new company during the previous winter. The Queen's men were at Court again for the Christmas season of 1585-6 and gave performances on 26 December, 1 January, and 13 February.<sup>2</sup> Wilson's presence with Leicester on 4 March may mean that the Queen's men paid a flying visit to Holland immediately after their last appearance at Court, but it is perhaps more likely that Wilson had rejoined Leicester's men for the expedition to the Low Countries, and that he, with some of the company, stayed on after Kemp and the others had gone back, and then returned to England in March.

R. C. BALD.

'HID IN', *LYCIDAS*, l. 69

Alas! What boots it with incessant care  
To tend the homely slighted shepherd's trade (65)  
And strictly meditate the thankless Muse?  
Were it not better done as others use  
To sport with Amaryllis in the shade  
Hid in the tangles of Neæra's hair?

'Hid in' is the original reading in Milton's autograph and the reading of the first edition (1638).

The shepherd and his meditated Muse, Amaryllis and the shade, are to be found together in Vergil, *Ecl.* 2 1-5. Amaryllis and Neæra are shepherdesses in *Ecl.* 3. A courtesan called Neæra, whose hair is praised, appears in Horace, *Od.* 3. 14. But, as far as I remember, in Vergil or Horace or elsewhere there is no instance of a young man sporting with one girl while hidden in the hair of another.<sup>3</sup> This extraordinary image would be easiest explained as an allusion to some frivolous piece of contemporary Cavalier Poetry which may or may not be preserved.<sup>4</sup>

Instead of 'Hid in' Milton, in the editions of 1645 and 1673, printed

<sup>1</sup> *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, 89.

<sup>2</sup> *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, 109.

<sup>3</sup> Since reading the proofs I can add this from Dickens. 'Ah! here was Alfred. Having stolen in unobserved, he playfully leaned on the back of Sophronia's chair, and, as Miss Podsnap saw him, put one of Sophronia's wandering locks to his lips, and waved a kiss from it towards Miss Podsnap' (*Our Mutual Friend*, book 2, ch. 4).

<sup>4</sup> An unnamed friend of T. Warton's detected Amaryllis and Neæra's hair in the Latin poems of G. Buchanan (1506-82); cf. Warton's note in his second edition of Milton's minor poems (1791) p. 474, reprinted in Todd's edition of Milton (1801) vol. VI, pp. 242-44. But what Buchanan says of his Neæra's hair is translated from *Anthol. Planud.* 7.39 (= *Anthol. Palat.* 5.230), and his Amaryllis is the city of Paris; nothing connects these poems with Milton. 'When I lie tangled in her hair', sings R. Lovelace in his famous poem 'To Althea, from Prison', about 1645: I owe this reference to the kindness of Mr. Norman Ault. To the parallels for the phrase 'tangled in her hair' which C. H. Wilkinson collects in his edition of Lovelace (1925, vol. I, p. 61) *Lycidas* l. 69 must be added; Lovelace might depend on the source to which Milton seems to allude.

'Or with'; in his autograph he crossed out 'hid in' and wrote 'or with' in the margin, presumably after 1638. Whether he rejected his first version because of its sensuousness or because the allusion was not actual enough any longer is difficult to decide. He certainly did not alter it to improve the style. 'Or with' produces an anticlimax, a zeugma and a slackness of rhythm which have led some modern scholars<sup>1</sup> to recommend the conjecture 'Or withe' (*i.e.* bind with withes, twigs of willow), though the verb 'withe' was never used for binding human hair, and Milton, after 'with' in the preceding line, would certainly not have written 'with' if he intended 'withe'.

Editors who feel the weakness of the received text might do better to restore the original reading: at least they should mention it.

P. MAAS.

#### A NOTE ON GEORGE HERBERT'S 'THE QUIDDITIE'

Many of Herbert's poems build themselves up from beginning to end in a close texture of argument, and the sense comes to a full close in the last line. It is in the interpretation of the last lines of his poems, however, that difficulty often lies, as in 'Vertue' (Hutchinson, 506) and 'The Answer' (*R.E.S.*, XVII, 352), and until the difficulty is resolved the poem vexes us where it should satisfy. 'The Quidditie' is an example of a poem the sense of which is clinched by the last words.

My God, a verse is not a crown,  
No point of honour, or gay suit,  
No hawk, or banquet, or renown,  
Nor a good sword, nor yet a lute:

It cannot vault, or dance, or play;  
It never was in *France* or *Spain*;  
Nor can it entertain the day  
With my great stable or domain:

It is no office, art, or news,  
Nor the Exchange, or busie Hall;  
But it is that which while I use  
I am with thee, and *most take all*.

The idea that the poet is being vague should be dismissed, for this poet is never vague; and if the last line is obscure, 'Time is to blame for the obscurity, not Herbert. 'Most take all' is a proverb rarely met with in print, and the only other example of it that I know is to be found in the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. R. W. Chapman, *Portrait of a Scholar* (1920) 13; Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, *Oxford Book of English Verse* (1939) 347; L. Untermeyer, *Treasury of Great Poetry English and American* (1942) 449. Professor Nichol Smith tells me that at the end of the last century the conjecture was attributed to J. S. Phillimore.

second (1678) edition of Ray's *Proverbs* among those sent to Ray from Somerset by Andrew Paschall. The sayings which Paschall collected are all popular proverbs and proverbial phrases, so that there is no danger that he was merely quoting Herbert. 'Most' is used in the sense of 'the most powerful' (*O.E.D.*, A, 4), and the meaning is similar to that of the proverb to which Herbert refers in 'Providence', l. 52: 'The great (fish) prey on (eat up) the little'. The poem is called 'The Quidditie' because in it the poet distinguishes the essence or quiddity of the spiritual life from the accidents of the world. As he writes his verses, dedicated not to the mundane activities, pleasures, and accomplishments enumerated in the poem but to the service of God, the poet is with God, and God the all-powerful takes complete possession of him ('*Most take all*'). The words are italicized in the early editions and in one of the two manuscripts in order to distinguish its proverbial nature and to detach it from the construction of the first part of the last line. It is characteristic of Herbert that at the climax of his poem he should express his surrender to God by transforming the meaning of this worldly proverb. Just so he transformed the 'Ars Amatoria' into the Art of God's Love ('The Thanksgiving'), appropriated the 'pure red and white' of the secular love-poets in a bold conceit on the agony and beauty of Christ ('Dulnesse'), and made use of a similar proverbial reflection on the greed of rich men—'much would have more'—to express man's importunity to God ('Gratefulnesse').

F. P. WILSON.

### ROCHESTER'S MARRIAGE

The story of the Earl of Rochester's romantic affair with Elizabeth Malet is well known, but the circumstances of his relations with her have never been satisfactorily explained. In brief, the chief known facts are these: (1) on the night of 25 May 1665 Rochester abducted Mistress Malet and ran away with her to Uxbridge; (2) he was promptly captured and sent to the Tower, and the young lady was restored to her family; (3) apparently there were no further negotiations between the two, yet on 29 January 1667 they were married.<sup>1</sup> Why, at the outset of the romance, Rochester found it necessary to resort to the desperate expedient of abduction,<sup>2</sup> what happened in the twenty months between that affair and the marriage, and how the marriage was finally achieved, are questions to which an investigation of Mistress Malet's family and background suggests some answers.

Our first notice of Elizabeth Malet comes from Pepys, who called her

<sup>1</sup> The story is best told by V. de Sola Pinto, *Rochester, Portrait of a Restoration Poet*, 1935, pp. 47-58.

<sup>2</sup> A felony since 1487. For parallels to Rochester's case, see G. S. Alleman, *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy*, 1942, pp. 51-9.

'the great beauty of the North'.<sup>1</sup> Actually, she was from Enmore, in Somersetshire. Pepys added the information that the lady was an heiress 'worth, and will be on her mother's death, who keeps but a little from her, £2500 per annum'. For several months the Earl of Sandwich (Pepys's patron) had been interested in her as a possible wife for Lord Hinchinbroke, his eldest son.<sup>2</sup>

The reference to Elizabeth's *mother* is significant. Yet, in spite of the fact that Elizabeth's father must have died some time before 1659, at least one modern biographer refers to her family as comprising her 'father, mother, and grandfather'.<sup>3</sup> But Elizabeth's mother had married a second husband: a neighbour in Somersetshire, Sir John Warre of Hestercombe.<sup>4</sup> By him she had a son, born in 1659 and named Francis, probably after her father, Francis, Lord Hawley.<sup>5</sup>

In 1665, then, Elizabeth Malet's family included four adults and one child. The courtier of the family was her grandfather, Francis, Lord Hawley (a widower) of Buckland-Sororum, Somersetshire, Baron of Donamore in Ireland, Member of Parliament, Lord-lieutenant of Somersetshire, commander of a troop of the King's Guards, and Groom of the Bedchamber to the Duke of York. He was considered something of a 'Court-Buffoon' who had 'got in Boons £20,000'.<sup>6</sup> Her stepfather, Sir John Warre, Knight, Sheriff of Somersetshire, and Member of Parliament from November 1665 until his death in 1669 or 1670, was an ambitious, aggressive man, with a keen eye for the main chance.<sup>7</sup> The others in the family were Elizabeth's mother, Unton Malet Warre, her half-brother Francis, six years old, and Elizabeth herself.

No doubt Rochester had been paying his addresses to Elizabeth for some

<sup>1</sup> *Diary*, 28 May 1665.

<sup>2</sup> See a letter from Sandwich to Bennett, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 5 December 1664, in which Elizabeth is referred to, not by name, but as 'a relation of Lord Hawley', her grandfather.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Williams, *Rochester*, 1935, p. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Johannes Prinz, *John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, 1926, pp. 178 and 273, mistakenly identifies Sir John Warre as Rochester's uncle. The mistake is perpetuated by John Hayward, *Works of Rochester*, 1926, p. 399. Oddly enough, both writers identify Lady Warre correctly as Rochester's mother-in-law.

<sup>5</sup> See Burke, *Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies*, and G. E. C., *Complete Baronetage*. According to Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*, Francis Warre was admitted to Oriel College on 16 October 1674 at the age of fifteen. In 1673 (four years after his father's death) Francis was created a baronet, possibly through Rochester's influence. The fee of £1,095, due for his patent, was given 'to Dame Unton Warre'. See *Williamson Letters*, II, 22, and *C.S.P.D.* 19 April, 23 May, 1673.

<sup>6</sup> See *A Seasonable Argument . . . for a New Parliament*, 1677, in Cobbett's *Parliamentary History*, IV, App. III.

<sup>7</sup> In 1667 he was made captain of a troop of horse (*C.S.P.D.*, 13 June 1667). In 1664 he, with Hawley and Sir William Wyndham, had engaged in a navigation scheme on the river near Bridgewater (*C.S.P.D.*, 15 October 1664). In 1670 he wrote to Lord Hawley of his desire for the grant of the place of comptroller of the customs at Bridgewater, 'worth £50 or £60 a year, as I could sell it for £300 or £400; if there is any hope, I will come to town, but would not come needlessly for so small an affair' (*C.S.P.D.*, 3 February 1670).



weeks before he abducted her. His lack of success with her, suggests Prinz, was due to the fact that Elizabeth was 'a deeply religious person', frightened by the rumour of Rochester's 'libertine exploits'.<sup>1</sup> Pinto blames the lady's guardians, who, he thinks, were horrified by the young earl's reputation.<sup>2</sup> But there is no evidence that Elizabeth was then deeply religious, and since, at the time of the abduction, Rochester had been at Court for only five months,<sup>3</sup> it is hardly likely that his reputation for wickedness had grown so formidable. The more obvious explanation is that Rochester was simply not a good match. He was barely eighteen; he had a comparatively new title, and no powerful kinsmen. He had no property but the little manor of Adderbury, no income but a pension of five hundred pounds a year from the King, and no prospects. Charles himself spoke for the young man, but the King's favour brought neither cash nor acres.

However Elizabeth may have felt toward Rochester, we may be certain that her guardians strongly opposed him. Therefore he abducted her, not improbably with her consent. The marriage was prevented by the prompt actions of Lord Hawley and Sir John Warre, and thereafter, we may be sure, great care was taken to see that the heiress was kept out of reach of the fortune-hunting earl. Elizabeth must marry, of course, but when she did so her very considerable property, in woods, lands, and water rights,<sup>4</sup> would pass from the Warres' control—and they had a son! It was much to their advantage to have Elizabeth marry a man of property, with whom they could drive a hard bargain, retaining something for themselves. The negotiator for the Sandwich family 'found the lady's guardians very unreasonable'.<sup>5</sup>

With Rochester apparently disposed of, Elizabeth's family put pressure on her to marry a man of wealth. Their first choice was Lord John Butler, son of the rich and powerful Duke of Ormonde, but others—a son of Lord Desmonde; young Lord Herbert, heir to the estates of Pembroke and Montgomery; Lord Hinchinbroke, son of the Earl of Sandwich; and Sir Francis Popham—appeared upon the scene during the years 1665 to 1667. Elizabeth (probably after the abortive affair with Rochester) had given her

<sup>1</sup> Prinz, *Rochester*, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> V. de Sola Pinto, *Rochester*, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> He returned from the grand tour on 25 December 1664. See a letter from Charles II in Julia Cartwright's *Madame*, 1901, p. 200.

<sup>4</sup> I have found nothing about Elizabeth's father, usually called simply John Malet, of Enmore. Her grandfather, also John Malet (see *The Visitation of Somersetshire*, 1623, p. 135), was evidently the money-maker of the family. He had been granted by Charles I extensive navigation rights on the rivers Parrett and Tone, and spent considerable sums to make those streams navigable (see *House of Lords Calendar*, 1 March 1672/3). According to Foster he matriculated at Balliol, 17 May 1588, aged fourteen, and died 10 April 1644.

<sup>5</sup> See F. R. Harris, *Life of Mountague, Earl of Sandwich*, 1912, II, 177.

guardians a promise not to marry without their consent,<sup>1</sup> but she evidently found none of the approved suitors to her liking. She seems to have amused herself with them, drinking Butler's health 'in a pretty big glasse halfe full of Clarett . . . more than ever shee did in her life',<sup>2</sup> making unconventional proposals to Lord Hinchinbroke, who was not 'pleased with the vanity and liberty of her carriage',<sup>3</sup> and commenting on her lovers, Portia-like, in frank and almost contemptuous fashion. Lord Herbert (she was reported as saying) 'would have had her'; Hinchinbroke 'was indifferent to have her'; Butler 'might not have her'; Rochester 'would have forced her'; and Popham 'would kiss her breach to have her'.<sup>4</sup> Yet, as she had told Hinchinbroke in August of 1666 (according to Pepys), her affections were settled—undoubtedly on my Lord Rochester. For after twenty months of temporizing she married him—suddenly, and without her family's consent.

But in January 1666/7, Rochester was no better a match than he had been in May 1665. He was two years older, and he had a double reputation—for bravery in naval war, and for audacity in the boudoir. But his estate was no whit bettered. Elizabeth, I suggest, married him for three reasons. First, she loved him, and—since he apparently made no attempt at any other heiress during the twenty-month period—it may be presumed that he loved her. Second, she had been a dutiful daughter long enough, had tried out a number of approved suitors and found them wanting. Third, she saw at last what her guardians were up to, 'that they were ready to "make a prey of her"'; her timber was cut down, her estate was lessened'.<sup>5</sup> There were limits to her endurance; promise or no promise, marry she would, and did.

The marriage was not clandestine; though no licence for the wedding is recorded, none was needed. The two were married at the proper canonical hour,<sup>6</sup> and, if they lacked the consent of Elizabeth's guardians, they had a greater authority. The Dowager Countess of Rochester wrote to her old friend Sir Ralph Verney:

. . . the King I thank god is very well satisfied with it, & they had his consent when they did it—but now we are in some care how too get the estate, they [the Warres] are come to desire to parties with friends, but I want a knowing frind in business, such a won as Sr Raph Verney.<sup>7</sup>

The Warres' might give up a daughter without argument, but not so easily her estate.

<sup>1</sup> Harris, *Sandwich*, p. 176.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Harris (p. 176) from a letter from Henry Nicholls to the Duke of Ormonde.

<sup>3</sup> Pepys, 26 August 1666.

<sup>4</sup> Pepys, 25 November 1666.

<sup>5</sup> Harris, *Sandwich*, p. 176.

<sup>6</sup> 'This morning—'. See *Le Fleming Manuscript*, p. 44, 29 January 1666/7.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted by Williams, *Rochester*, p. 39.

That there was a real affection between the two young people is evidenced by the letters we have, written between them in the years after their marriage. Had Rochester been as wealthy as, say, Lord John Butler, I submit the marriage would in all probability have been celebrated much earlier than it was, and there would have been no romantic abduction, no imprisonment in the Tower, no banishment from Court—and no problem for biographers.

J. HAROLD WILSON.

### JOHNSON'S LITERARY EARNINGS: A PROBLEM

Johnson wrote to Thrale 23 June 1779:

I have sent you an hundred pounds to keep for me. It will come within one day of quarter day, and that day you must give me. I came by it in a very uncommon manner, and would not confound it with the rest.

Evidently Thrale paid interest on such moneys. Hill, referring to the letter of 5 March 1781 (discussed below), conjectured that the £100 was part payment for the *Lives*. But would this be regarded as uncommonly come by, or made a mystery? Johnson had been writing for money all his life. The terms for the *Lives*, moreover, must have been well known at Streatham; why should that money, or any part of it, be kept separate?

The terms for the *Lives* are known; see *Life* iii. 111. Johnson, asked to name his terms, named 200 guineas. The booksellers, a little ashamed of their bargain—for the sum asked was absurd in itself, and made more so when Johnson wrote, perhaps, four times as much as had been contemplated—added a third hundred; and when he revised his work in 1783, they added a fourth. (I neglect the difference between pounds and guineas.)

I come now to the letter to Strahan of 5 March 1781:

Having now done my lives I shall have money to receive, and shall be glad to add to it, what remains due for the Hebrides, which you cannot charge [me] with grasping very rapaciously. The price was two hundred Guineas or pounds; I think first pounds then Guineas. I have had one hundred.

The delay in settling the account for the *Journey* had been referred to before, in a letter to Strahan of 7 November 1778. Johnson there wrote that he had a need for £100 for a friend, and added 'There is my old reckoning with Mr. Cadell. Do look it out at last'. If the figures of 5 March 1781 refer to the *Journey*, it looks as if they tallied closely with this letter.

The 'two hundred' of 5 March 1781 might be Johnson's recollection, as Hill assumed, of the terms for the *Lives*. But the natural interpretation is that Johnson means the terms for the *Journey*. I know of no direct evidence on that; but there is perhaps a side-light. When Johnson and Boswell were together, 5 April 1776, Boswell wanted him to make a book of the

projected Italian tour. 'I do not see that I could make a book upon Italy; yet I should be glad to get two hundred pounds, or five hundred pounds, by such a work'. (*Life* iii. 19.) The higher figure may be rhetorical; but Johnson might think that if he should write a book after seeing 'Rome, Naples, Florence, and Venice, and as much more as we can', it would be worth more than twice as much as the book on the Hebrides. At least his language does not contradict the supposition that £200 was the price of that book.

The problem of the 'uncommon' £100 remains. The possibility occurs that it came from Government in recognition of public services. Johnson's political tracts, published at various dates, had been collected in a volume in 1776. This might explain the mysterious tone of his letter; for in general he had few secrets—perhaps no financial secrets—from the Thrales.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

#### DISRAELI AND THACKERAY

Disraeli's election to Parliament in 1837 naturally determined that his future associations should be in political rather than literary circles. Hence, none of the great Victorians of literature—Tennyson, Browning, Dickens, Thackeray, Ruskin, or Carlyle—were numbered among his friends, although Tennyson was to refuse a baronetcy at his hands in 1874 and Carlyle the Grand Cross of the Bath. Even the early friendship with Bulwer, who introduced Disraeli to society in 1832, waned with time. There is evidence, however, that at least one of the Victorian giants desired the acquaintance, if not the friendship, of Disraeli and made more than one effort to win it. This was Thackeray.

Shortly after the publication of *Coningsby* (May, 1844)—the best of Disraeli's political novels—Arethusa Milner-Gibson, wife of the well-known radical politician and former schoolmate of Disraeli, wrote to Mrs. Disraeli that Thackeray very much admired Disraeli and wished to meet him. Would the Disraelis come to lunch with Thackeray present? Thackeray, she continues, is the author of the review of *Coningsby* in the 'Morning Chronicle' and 'is fearful that you and Mr. Disraeli might not like to meet him, and so he throws himself at my feet (in a note) to know if he may make your acquaintance—he is an odd man!—he spoke of *Coningsby* in raptures. . . . With all his brusquerie and oddity he is very shy and timid'.<sup>1</sup>

Mrs. Milner-Gibson was a leader of society whose salon was frequented by such distinguished exiles as Napoleon III, Mazzini, Victor Hugo, and

<sup>1</sup> From the original unpublished letter in the Disraeli archives at Hughenden Manor.

Louis Blanc, and by such English literary celebrities as Thackeray and Dickens. Her letter to Mrs. Disraeli is partly the means of the first positive identification of the review in the 'Morning Chronicle' as Thackeray's.<sup>1</sup> Though the tone of this review was bantering, it was not an unjust estimate of *Coningsby*, predicting, as it did, 'extensive popularity' for the book, praising the 'wonderful truth' in the sketches of minor politicians and political hangers-on, admiring the 'vivid correctness' of Disraeli's analysis of the weaknesses of the Conservative party, but scorning the 'unscrupulousness' with which contemporary personages appear as characters in the novel,<sup>2</sup> poking gentle fun at the 'superb coxcombry' and other extravagances, ironically exposing the most glaring absurdities, such as Disraeli's dicta on race, and criticizing the vagueness of the political doctrine, which offers no real salvation from the evils so accurately described by the author.

The meeting between Thackeray and Disraeli did not occur at this time, in spite of Mrs. Milner-Gibson's good offices, though the reason is much more likely to have been the pressure of other engagements than any offence that Disraeli took at Thackeray's review. For, far from offensive, the review must have stimulated a good deal of curiosity that could only have been satisfied by a reading of the book; and no author could really ask more of a reviewer. But the author of *Coningsby* was the man of the hour,<sup>3</sup> and the claims upon his time must have been many. At any rate—for whatever reason—the meeting did not come off. Thackeray, however, did not let the matter drop. A short time later Mrs. Milner-Gibson wrote to Mary Anne Disraeli again on the same subject.

Mr. Thackeray (Michael Angelo Titmarsh) has spoken to me in raptures of *Coningsby*. . . . He could not say too much of it. . . . He is a great worshipper of Mr. Disraeli's genius, he swears by it; I should like you to meet him. . . . He so admires Mr. Disraeli, so frankly and truly, that it is a pleasure to hear him.<sup>4</sup>

Whether the Disraelis acted upon this second hint or not is unknown. The acquaintance was certainly made, however, prior to 10 August of this year, when Thackeray wrote in his notebook as follows: 'Read for B[arry] L[yndon] all the morning at the club, then walked—A pleasant dinner at Disraeli's.'<sup>5</sup> To Mr. Malcolm Elwin's conjecture that Thackeray may have

<sup>1</sup> See my letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* for 19 December 1942.

<sup>2</sup> This turns out to be a curious objection in view of the fact that Thackeray was to pick up three of the 'originals' from the novel and portray them in *Vanity Fair*. These were the Marquis of Hertford (Disraeli's Marquis of Monmouth), portrayed as the Marquis of Steyne; John Wilson Croker (Disraeli's Rigby), portrayed as Wenham; and Lord Lonsdale (Disraeli's Lord Eskdale), portrayed as Lord Colchicum.

<sup>3</sup> 'This season has been auspicious', observed the 'Morning Chronicle' (in the 31 May issue—not in the review by Thackeray). 'It has produced *Coningsby*—in itself worth a whole library'.

<sup>4</sup> From the original undated letter in the Hughenden archives.

<sup>5</sup> *The Works of William Makepeace Thackeray, with Biographical Introductions by his Daughter, Anne Ritchie* (London, 1899), IV, xxxv.

met Disraeli at Harrison Ainsworth's or in company with Monckton Milnes,<sup>1</sup> I can only add that there is excellent likelihood that they met at the Milner-Gibsons'. It is clear, however, that though Thackeray may have admired Disraeli's genius—and his speech at the Royal Literary Fund dinner in 1851 supports Mrs. Milner-Gibson's statement—nothing approaching friendship ever developed between the two men. This nevertheless need imply no aversion to Thackeray on the part of Disraeli, who was never very fond of masculine society. All the close friendships of his life were with women.

Three years after the publication of *Coningsby*, however, Thackeray burlesqued the novel in his series of 'novels by eminent hands' in *Punch*. Thackeray enthusiasts, following Trollope, profess to admire '*Codlingsby*, by B. de Shrewsbury, Esq.',<sup>2</sup> but partisans of Disraeli are more likely to agree with Disraeli's biographer that it was not a very happy performance.<sup>3</sup> However that may be, there can be no doubt that its ridicule of the character Sidonia (who stands for Disraeli blessed with the Rothschild millions) and his disquisitions on the accomplishments of the Jewish race, could hardly have failed to nettle Disraeli.<sup>4</sup> He was not much accustomed to harbour animosities, but he did not forget Thackeray's picture of Rafael Mendoza, the old clothes man whose business is lending millions to monarchs and whose pleasure is laying claim to all the worthwhile achievements of the world for the Jews. With the publication of *Codlingsby* all possibility of friendship between Disraeli and Thackeray came to an end; and in 1862 John Hollingshead saw the two men pass each other at the Exhibition of that year without acknowledgment.<sup>5</sup>

In writing *Codlingsby*, Thackeray had borne Disraeli no ill will. It was all in the way of bread and butter with him. He had, in fact, originally planned satires of himself and Charles Dickens in the series, but Mark Lemon (the editor of *Punch*) had vetoed any satire of Dickens; so neither was written.<sup>6</sup> Bulwer-Lytton, Mrs. Gore, G. P. R. James, Fenimore

<sup>1</sup> Malcolm Elwin, *Thackeray: A Personality* (London, 1932), p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> Disraeli was member for Shrewsbury at this time. The by-line was subsequently altered to 'D. Shrewsbury, Esq.', which it bears in the biographical edition of Thackeray's works.

<sup>3</sup> Monypenny and Buckle, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli* (New York, 1929), II, 1435.

<sup>4</sup> 'Seeing that Sidonia stood as a type of [the Rothschilds] in *Coningsby*', observes Wilfrid Meynell, *Benjamin Disraeli, an Unconventional Biography* (London, 1903), I, 21-2, 'it is rather curious to note that Disraeli suspected an author whom he did not love—Thackeray—of having an eye on them for "copy". The occasion was that of a banquet at Sir Anthony Rothschild's, given in honour of the wedding of a brother-in-law, Montefiore, with a daughter of Baron de Goldsmid. Dizzy did not go to it—he was a tied-down politician in 1850—but his wife did. "The Hebrew aristocracy", he reported at second hand, "assembled in great force and numbers, mitigated by the Dowager of Morley, Charles Villiers, Abel Smiths, and Thackeray. I think he will sketch them in the last number of *Pendennis*.'"

<sup>5</sup> Elwin, p. 124.

<sup>6</sup> Lewis Melville, *William Makepeace Thackeray* (London, 1910), I, 289.



Cooper, Disraeli, and Lever, however, were burlesqued; but the inclusion of Lever, with whom Thackeray was very friendly, indicates that there was no ill feeling in any of it. Indeed, Thackeray made up handsomely to Disraeli for any hurt that *Codlingsby* might have inflicted. In 1851 and again in 1852 he went out of his way to praise Disraeli at the Royal Literary Fund dinner for the credit his career reflected upon the whole profession of letters. In 1851 he said:

If you will but look at the novelists of the present day, I think you will see it is altogether out of the question to pity them. We will take in the first instance, if you please, a great novelist who is the great head of a great party in a great assembly in the country. When this celebrated man went into his county and proposed to represent it, and was asked on what interest he stood, he nobly said he stood on his head. And I want to know who can deny the gallantry and brilliancy of that eminent crest of his, and question the merit of Mr. Disraeli.<sup>1</sup>

Thackeray himself sent a copy of the speech to Mrs. Disraeli in proof 'that some authors can praise other authors behind their backs',<sup>2</sup> so that Disraeli could not have been in ignorance of Thackeray's remarks. In 1852 Thackeray again complimented Disraeli. Speculating upon the subject-matter of future novelists, he imagined them employing incidents and people of his own day.

Could a romance writer in after-years have a better or more wondrous hero than that of an individual who at twenty years of age wrote *Vivian Grey*, and a little while afterwards *The Wondrous Tale of Alroy*; who then explained to a breathless and listening world the great Caucasian mystery; who then went into politics faced, fought, and conquered the great political giant of these days; and who subsequently led thanes and earls to battle, while he caused reluctant squires to carry his lance? What a hero would not that be for some future novelist, and what a magnificent climax for the third volume of his story, when he led him, in his gold coat of office, to kiss the Queen's hand as the Chancellor of the Exchequer!<sup>3</sup>

A handsomer compliment would be difficult to imagine. But the stinging burlesque of *Codlingsby* apparently remained in Disraeli's memory longer than the two speeches. It is unfortunate that he did not know Thackeray well enough to realize the personal goodness of the man. In the absence of such intimate knowledge he was too susceptible to the unconsidered judgments of others in forming an opinion of Thackeray. What that opinion was, in part, is to be found in a note buried in some miscellaneous manuscripts written down in a period of inactivity following Disraeli's first Ministry in 1868, and preserved with the other Disraeli archives at Hughenden. A mere jotting, it reads:

<sup>1</sup> Monypenny and Buckle, II, 1436.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> From the *Times* report, as quoted by Monypenny and Buckle (I, 1163). It differs somewhat from the report in Melville's biography, which was taken from another source.

George Smythe<sup>1</sup> said that, as they say, novelists always draw their own characters, he wished to God Thackeray would draw his own. That would be a character—the Cynic Parasite!

But inasmuch as Thackeray was not obliging enough to draw such a portrait of himself, Disraeli undertook the task seventeen years after the death of Thackeray. In his last novel, *Endymion* (1880), he drew a devastating caricature of Thackeray in his portrait of St. Barbe, envious of his more successful rival Gushy, satirical of the aristocracy behind their backs but grovelling before any star and ribbon in his presence, and bloated with his own minor success after his return from service as Paris correspondent for an English journal. In later life he grows indolent and professes always to be collecting material in society for novels that never appear. 'If I had been born in any country but this', he laments, 'I should have been decorated, and perhaps made secretary of state like Addison, who did not write as well as I do, though his style somewhat resembles mine.' In the opinion of Disraeli's hero, he is 'the vainest, the most envious, and the most amusing of men'. Snobbishness is perhaps the most obvious characteristic of St. Barbe, as it was, following Edmund Yates, the most common accusation against Thackeray in his own day. Though the exaggeration of the whole sketch makes it completely unjust as a portrait of Thackeray, paradoxically it is one of the most successful characterizations in the novel.

C. L. CLINE.

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards seventh Viscount Strangford. The hero of *Coningsby* is an idealized portrait of Smythe, who appears also, less idealized, as Waldershare in Disraeli's *Endymion*.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE WORD 'MUING' IN MILTON'S *AREOPAGITICA*

THE EDITOR, *The Review of English Studies*.

SIR,

My attention, I regret to say, has only just been called to a communication by R. S. Loomis, 'A Note on the *Areopagitica*', in *Modern Language Notes*,<sup>1</sup> of which I was completely ignorant when writing my Note on the word 'muing' printed in the *Review of English Studies* for January last (p. 61). My apologies are due to Mr. Loomis, as well as to your readers, for failing to take notice of his publication.

His suggestion is that 'muing' is an error, not for 'renewing', but for 'newing', the suggestion having apparently arisen in his mind from the wording of the Middle English Bestiary printed from Arundel MS. 292 in E.E.T.S., vol. 49, p. 3, 'wu he newed his gudhede'. The suggestion is supported (1) by reference to the specimen of Milton's handwriting of 1637 in the Commonplace Book published by the Royal Society of Literature, p. 13, where the *new* of *renew* might have been read as *mu* had the hand been a little more careless, (2) by the fact that there are several other misprints in the 1644 edition of the *Areopagitica*.<sup>2</sup> Reference is also made to Psalm 103.5, and Mr. Loomis states his conclusion as follows: 'The inevitable influence of the Bestiary and the probable influence of the Bible upon the passage persuade me that "muing" should be regarded as a misprint, and that succeeding editions of the *Areopagitica* should substitute *newing*'.

The biblical allusiveness of the *whole* passage, which to me gave the key to its meaning and to the course of Milton's thought, does not seem to have been recognized.

Yours faithfully,  
G. UDNY YULE.

### THE PLACE-NAMES OF ESSEX

THE EDITOR, *The Review of English Studies*.

SIR,

Mr. P. H. Reaney rightly objects (*R.E.S.* XVII, p. 337) to the point which he cites from my review of his *Place-Names of Essex* (*R.E.S.* XV, p. 120). May I point out that I had already withdrawn my remarks, in an *addendum* published in the issue following that in which my review appeared (*R.E.S.* XV, p. 246)?

Yours faithfully,  
G. V. SMITHERS.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. XXXII, 1917, pp. 437-8.

<sup>2</sup> Edition of J. W. Hales, 1904, pp. 17, 18, 29, 49, 195.

## REVIEWS

**The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. A Survey of the Foundations of the Text.** By W. W. GREG. The Clark Lectures, Trinity College, Cambridge, Lent Term, 1939. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1942. Pp. lvi+210. 12s. 6d. net.

This book has two main subjects, the history of the transmission of Shakespeare's plays down to the 'substantive' witnesses (pp. 1-157) and the technique to be applied to their critical editing (pp. vii-lv). There are, moreover, a collection of illustrative stage-directions (pp. 158-81), elaborate indexes in different forms (pp. 183-210), and a short preface dealing especially with the relation of the book to McKerrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (1939).

The whole book shows the unique accuracy, clearness, sagacity, and circumspection which characterizes all works by Dr. Greg. Its historical part critically summarizes the enormous amount of research work done since Malone, and particularly by the 'bibliographical' school whose leader and most active member Dr. Greg has now been for more than thirty years. The part which concerns the technique of editing marks a decisive step forward from McKerrow's orthodoxy towards the eclecticism which the character of the transmission requires. The book is a standard work, a sound basis for all future research in this large field of science. In the following pages I shall select some problems which seem to me to merit further discussion.

(1) THE EDITORIAL PROBLEM. 'There is . . . one critical need that is universal and fundamental, namely to determine the nature and authority of the text or texts in which an author's works have come down to us. Until that has been established, or until we have at least reached some hypothesis that for the time being satisfies us, we can hardly begin to consider what were the actual words he wrote, much less what was the meaning he intended to convey' (p. 2).

The second of these sentences is affected by the fact that our judgement on the nature and authority of a text depends to a large extent on the readings we choose (or even create by conjecture) and the meaning we attribute to them.<sup>1</sup> But the whole paragraph is evidently exaggerated, a very rare thing in Dr. Greg's work. He surely will admit that many important problems of Textual

<sup>1</sup> This was clearly pointed out by Dr. Greg himself, *Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare*, 1928, note 7. Here are some examples. In *Rich. III.* I. iv, the introduction of a new character after l. 75 (*Enter Brakenbury the lieutenant F*, omitted Qq) in my opinion, as probably in that of most editors, destroys one of the greatest beauties of the play. Yet to prefer Qq has far-reaching consequences which affect our judgement upon the nature of the manuscript on which F depends. Dr. Greg does not mention the problem. In *2 Henry IV* it is important to know if there are errors common to Q and F (Dr. Greg, p. 115, etc., cf. Index). The most significant of such errors was thought to be *Poins* in II. ii. 80 Globe (71 Arden, 82 Craig), generally replaced by *Bardolph*. In 1940 Mr. M. A. Shaaber showed in the *New Variorum Shakespeare* that *Poins* is right. But there remains in l. i. 162 *Bardolph* (Q F) which P. A. Daniel replaced by *Morton*, deleting *Morton* in l. 163. I do not know his reasons, but the alteration seems to me stylistically convincing. Shifting of speakers' names points to 'foul papers'.

Criticism and of interpretation have been splendidly and finally solved before even an attempt at that determination which he requires was possible. The organism of a literary work of art, especially of a classical one, has a kind of self-healing power which the circumstances of transmission can never totally annihilate: *invenies etiam disiecti membra poetae*.

(2) THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPROACH. The approach to textual problems which distinguishes the book (and the school to which it belongs) from eighteenth- or nineteenth-century criticism, is called 'bibliographical' 'since it lays stress upon the material processes of book-production, concerning itself primarily with the fortunes of the actual pieces of paper on which the texts were written or printed . . . rather than with the literary characteristics of the texts in question. Bibliographers have in fact brought criticism down from the fascinating but too often barren heights of æsthetic and philosophic speculation to the concrete familiarities of the theatre, the scrivener's shop, and the printing house' (p. 3). One might, however, point out that the bibliographical evidence concerning Shakespeare's plays is in many cases very scanty and fortuitous, and that the conclusions to be drawn from it on the nature of the transmitted text are more or less conjectural<sup>1</sup> and controversial. We need, I think, both æsthetic and 'bibliographical' speculation, and Dr. Greg in a less conspicuous passage, confesses to a similar opinion: 'though as a rule I deprecate relying on personal judgement of style, I must admit that it becomes increasingly necessary' (p. xxv).

(3) SUBSTANTIVE AND DERIVATIVE WITNESSES. The most essential difference between witnesses in Textual Criticism (and elsewhere) is between those which do not depend on an extant witness and those which do. McKerrow (*Proleg.* p. 82) has called the independent ones 'substantive' and Dr. Greg accepts the term (cf. Index). It is in fact preferable to 'independent' because it is positive, and in Textual Criticism can easily be confined to the technical usage. 'Derivative' means 'derived from an extant source'. In the part written before McKerrow's book appeared, Dr. Greg often uses the term of 'bad' quartos to indicate that they are not first drafts or source plays but dependent on the Shakespearean plays which we know from F (pp. 9, 69, 73 ff.). But then 'derivative' does not account for the presumable difference between the lost copy for F on which the quarto depends, and F itself. In fact, the 'bad quartos' are wholly 'substantive' as all first quartos necessarily are, and Dr. Greg need not apologize for treating them in a survey of the foundations of the text (p. 23).

Textual witnesses can be substantive either in their own right by being wholly dependent on a lost witness, or by representing a conflation of an extant ancestor with a lost one. For instance, F gives in some plays a text derived as well from an extant quarto as from a lost manuscript with which the quarto had been collated. Dr. Greg distinguishes between 'sporadic conflation', which would not affect the derivative character of the witness, and a conflation so extensive as to give the witness substantive character (p. xv). The distinction seems to me arbitrary, because there can be no objective criterion for finding the limit between the two kinds of conflation, and useless, because if one variant of a text (as compared with its extant ancestor) is proved to be substantive, then every one of its variants becomes potentially substantive and must be examined for authenticity just as if the witness were substantive in its own right.<sup>2</sup> Certainly for the doubtful

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Greg's attempt to explain the nature of the copy for Q1 of *Rich. III* (p. 85 f.) is speculative to a high degree.

<sup>2</sup> In his '*Principles of Emendation*' Dr. Greg wrote of Q1 of *Romeo and Juliet*: 'if it is

variants the probability of any one being substantive increases with the number of those proved to be substantive; but this does not change the nature of the witness. The problem is connected with the conception of the 'most authoritative' text, upon which a word or two will be said later under the heading 'Copy-text'.

The substantive witnesses, all of them,<sup>1</sup> and only they, are the foundations of the text. The derivative witnesses have no value at all as witnesses. Yet they are not always completely useless. Where a witness which is substantive through conflation is derived from a derivative witness (as F from Q6 in *Rich. III*), this derivative witness sometimes helps to distinguish between the derivative and the substantive elements in the conflated witness (cf. Dr. Greg, p. 88). Besides, the deliberate alterations which the text of the substantive quartos underwent in the derivative quartos from 1598 onwards, and in F where it is derivative, may indicate what kind of changes we must expect to have occurred during the same period in the text of early plays which we know only from F. Strangely enough, there is still no systematic survey of these alterations (cf. Black and Shaaber, *Shakespeare's Seventeenth-century Editors*, 1937, pp. vii f.).<sup>2</sup>

(4) 'BAD', 'DOUBTFUL', AND 'GOOD' QUARTOS. Before Dr. Greg's study 'bad' and 'good', of quartos, meant 'reported on the basis of memory' and 'derived by copying'. The reported quartos were bad by nature, the 'good' quartos, if not good of themselves, at least were not obviously inferior to F. Dr. Greg classifies the first quartos of *Rich. III* and *King Lear* as 'doubtful' because, though probably reported, they are not bad. Thus the terms 'good' and 'bad' lose their discriminating power, and we should have to differentiate 'ill reported', 'well reported', and 'not reported' quartos. But even that classification would be precarious. The characterization of the quartos of *Rich. III* and *King Lear* as reported is not based on the general quality of their text, but on certain peculiarities of their variation from F. Thus where F is wholly derivative from an extant quarto not much superior in quality to that of *Rich. III*, we can never be sure that the quarto is not a 'well-reported' one. Shall we then introduce further subdivisions, quartos 'not proved to be reported' and quartos 'proved not to be reported'? Perhaps it would be preferable not to classify substantive quartos at all. In fact, the individual features and problems are the things that matter.

(5) HEMINGE AND CONDELL V. QUARTOS.

. . . Where before you were abused with divers stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of injurious impostors that

once admitted that [it] is right in two score cases, there is no particular reason to jib at six score' (p. 21). He now declares this to have been 'a hasty judgement' (p. 75<sup>3</sup>), but does not give his reasons. I should like to know them. Meanwhile, I beg to recommend some unfashionable readings of Q1: II. ii. 170 (before 'I have forgotten' insert *Romeo!*; III. v. 47 *Ere I see thee again* instead of *Ere I again behold my Romeo*; IV. v. 33 *Paris for Friar*.

<sup>1</sup> Including quotations. R. Hoppe, *R.E.S.* xiv. (1938) 282, has identified *Romeo* and *Juliet* IV. v. 65 (Q1, 1598) *O peace, for shame, if not for charity* with *Rich. III*, I. iii. 273. The quotation is independent of the quartos of *Rich. III* (Q1, 1597) which instead of *Peace, peace give Have done* (from I. 279). T. Heywood's *King Edward IV* (1599) *passim* is another substantive witness for *Rich. III*.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Greg touches this problem only slightly in a note to p. 2. He says there that Q3 of *Rich. III* 'seems to have received some editorial supervision' (cf. p. 86<sup>3</sup>). I find no essential difference between the alterations in Q3 and those in Q2, of which Dr. Greg says that it is 'everywhere . . . a slavish reprint of Q1' (p. 874); the alterations are simply more numerous in Q3 than in Q2, but all are either conjectural or accidental. In IV. i. 89 a conjecture of Q2, *Queen for Dorset*, has deceived the Cambridge Editors (1865) and W. J. Craig (1928), though the reading of Q1 was restored in F from the manuscript.



exposed them, even those are now offered to your view cured and perfect of their limbs, and all the rest absolute in their numbers as he conceived them.

Heminge and Condell (or whoever drafted the preface which they signed) say nothing about some essential facts which only very few of the 'great variety of readers' could know; viz. (a) that for many plays there were reliable quartos and that some of these had been simply reprinted in F; (b) that two of the comparatively few unreliable quartos had been superseded by reliable ones for twenty years; (c) that the greater part of the plays was published by them for the first time. In other words: they speak about the 'bad' quartos only and remain silent about the chief merit of the Folio, which is that it contains many plays for which there were no quartos at all. This suggests that they intended the public to infer that all quartos were bad. They were honest in what they wrote but not fair in what they left unwritten. To say, as Dr. Greg does (p. 8), that 'they may have been perfectly honest' is too kind, to say that they 'represent' all quartos as mutilated (as Malone did) is too unkind to them.

The quartos were cheap, the Folio was expensive. Heminge and Condell enlarge upon the high price of the Folio in the paragraph (seldom discussed) which precedes their attack on the quartos. They may have wanted to prevent the great variety of readers from buying quartos whatever their quality, or from being satisfied with those they possessed. Therefore their characterization of their own texts as 'absolute in their numbers as he conceived them', and 'published according to the true original copies' is from the outset likely to be a statement to which no exact meaning can be attached. We learn much more about their work by comparing their texts with those which they reprinted. They have done much good work, but in *Rom. and Jul.* a contemporaneous editor (Q4) has surpassed them.<sup>1</sup>

P. MAAS.

(To be continued)<sup>2</sup>

**George Whetstone. Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters.** By THOMAS C. IZARD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942; London: Humphrey Milford, 1943. Pp. x+297. 25s. net.

On page 129 of this volume Mr. Izard remarks that 'the works of Googe, Turberville, Gascoigne, Stanyhurst, Churchyard, Whetstone and others of their time naturally suffer by comparison with those of Spenser, Shakespeare, and the many great writers who began to flourish about 1590. But the accomplishments of the greatest age in literature were, it must be remembered, made possible by the period of experiment which preceded'. This period of experiment has of late increasingly attracted the attention of scholars, especially in relation to the careers and achievements of Turberville and Gascoigne. In his detailed study

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tycho Mommsen in his edition (1859) pp. 39 ff., 52 ff. Dr. Greg finds reference to any independent source unlikely in Q4 (p. 23). I should think the agreement of Q4 with Q1 in II. i. 38 *open etcetera (et cetera om. Qq2, 3)* and in I. i. 206 *Bid a sick man . . . make (A sick man . . . makes Qq2, 3)* would alone be sufficient to exclude conjecture; but there are a score of other, if less significant, agreements of Q4 with Q1 against Qq2, 3. It follows that Q4 has collated either Q1 or a common source. Readings like III. iii. 144 *pouts upon Q4 (frownst upon Q1, puts up Qq2, 3)* and IV. i. 100 *paly Q4 (maly Qq2, 3)*, the line not in Q1 support the common source theory without making it certain.

<sup>2</sup> In the second part of his review, which we hope to publish in January, Professor Maas will deal in the main with Dr. Greg's views on the technique of editing.—Ed. R.E.S.

of the life and work of George Whetstone Mr. Izard has enabled us to come into closer intimacy than hitherto with another of the leading figures of the mid-Elizabethan literary epoch.

Whetstone's father, Robert, was a well-to-do haberdasher who, besides considerable London property, owned estates in various counties specified in his will dated 9 August 1557. From the hypothetical intervals between the births of the children therein mentioned, Mr. Izard suggests that George's natal year may well have been 1551 instead of the conventionally accepted 1544. Of his school or college education nothing is known, but as a poem in his first work *The Rocke of Regard* (1576) is addressed to 'my friends and companions at Furnival's Inn', he would appear to have been a law-student there. This is made the more probable, as Mr. Izard notes, by the legal precision of his language and references in parts of *The English Myrror*. A prose section of *The Rocke of Regard*, 'Inventions of P. Plasmos', shows Whetstone having an affair with a faithless beauty, becoming financially involved, and being maimed in his right hand in a brawl. Whetstone himself testifies that under feigned names this account is autobiographical. On the other hand, as Mr. Izard shows, it is a mistake to interpret similarly a poem in the same work, 'The Honest Minded Mans Adventures', from which it has been wrongly inferred that Whetstone was in turn a courtier, an officer in the 1572 expedition to the Low Countries, and a farmer. The adventure in which he did take part was Sir Humphrey Gilbert's 1578 overseas expedition which ended unfortunately. Nor was his luck much better on a journey to Italy in 1580 when, owing to a quarrel with a Spaniard, he was refused admission to Rome.

On his return to England Whetstone was involved for several years in litigation which Mr. Izard suggests may have arisen out of family complications due to the terms of Robert Whetstone's will. It was not George but his elder brother Bernard who accompanied the Earl of Leicester to the Netherlands in December 1585, and who took part in the charge at Zutphen where Sidney received his death wound on 22 September 1586. It was not till nearly a year later, in August 1587, that George followed his brother to the Low Countries as a commissary of musters. From letters among the State Papers, to which Dr. Mark Eccles first drew attention, the circumstances of his death within a month of his arrival have been made clear. The mustermaster reports that he was slain by a captain, and adds, 'I found him indeed so careful, honest, and just, as his death is unto me very grievous'. The captain, Edmund Udall, who had proved his bravery at Zutphen, was cleared by a military court on the ground that he had acted in defence of his reputation, though this verdict was challenged by Sir Thomas Morgan. In the light of Mr. Izard's careful analysis of all the available biographical evidence no 'gentleman of letters', even in that turbulent age, can have suffered more throughout at fortune's hands than George Whetstone.

And this ill-fortune has continued to pursue him after death. To the majority of readers he is known merely as the writer of *Promos and Cassandra*; and for his 'frail grasp on immortality' he is indebted, as Mr. Izard puts it, 'to the compilers of Shakespeare handbooks, who inform us that Whetstone wrote an unwieldy ten-act play, published in 1578 but never acted, from which Shakespeare quarried much of the stuff for *Measure for Measure*'. On the relations of these two plays and of *Promos and Cassandra* to the earlier versions of the story in dramatic or narrative form, even Mr. Izard's detailed investigation could not add much to the previous labours of Dr. F. E. Budd and others. Attention therefore

may be more fruitfully directed to his chapters on Whetstone's less familiar works. The first of these, *The Rocke of Regard* (1576), a loosely connected four-part miscellany of verse and prose, is chiefly of interest, as noted above, in its bearing on Whetstone's biography. But it also illustrates at this early stage his gift of dealing in realistic style with derivative material.

In *An Heptameron of Civill Discourses* (1582) derivative material is better organized and grouped round the central theme of marriage. The background was suggested by his Italian journey and the framework by Sir Thomas Hoby's translation of Castiglione's *Cortegiano*. In a palace near Ravenna a company of gentlemen and ladies during seven days hold festival and discuss on each day an aspect of married life, illustrated by one or more stories. These are drawn from Marguerite of Navarre, Painter, Bandello, Boccaccio, Cinthio and others, but they are expanded and diversified by additions from Whetstone's general reading, e.g. from Golding's *Ovid*, Pliny's *Natural History* and Plutarch's *Moralia*. Particularly noteworthy, as Mr. Izard makes clear, is his use of the Spaniard Pedro Mexia's *Silva de varia leccion* in two French translations by Claude Gruget and Du Verdier. A deceptive impression of Whetstone's learning is conveyed by numerous classical references borrowed from these sources. 'The book', as Mr. Izard sums up, 'is a kind of precipitation from a solution made of an infinite number of ingredients culled more or less unconsciously by the author.' But he manages to give them, taken as a whole, the stamp of his high-minded attitude towards matrimony.

From the first there had been a didactic strain in Whetstone's writings, but this becomes predominant in *A Mirour for Magistrates of Cyties* and *A Touchstone for the Time* (1584), paged continuously and bound together. The former of these tracts gives an account of the reforms of the Roman emperor, Alexander Severus, as an example to be followed in London, and is accordingly dedicated to the Lord Mayor and other City officials. His chief source, though he nowhere mentions it, appears to have been Sir Thomas Elyot's *Image of Governance*, his own main contribution being three speeches by the emperor; 'a result', in Mr. Izard's view, 'of the revived interest in ancient rhetoric in general and the oration in particular, which came with the Renaissance'. In *A Touchstone for the Time* he comes to grips directly with the social evils of London, especially in the life of the taverns, and urges the stricter enforcement of the laws.

Whetstone's moralizing zeal found another outlet in *The Honourable Reputation of a Souldier* (1585). A number of treatises were appearing about this time on various aspects of the military art, but Whetstone's work is differentiated from them by being a conduct book for the perfect soldier, anticipating, as Mr. Izard suggests, Steele's *The Christian Hero*. Here again Gruget's version of Mexia's *Silva* furnished most of the material, especially the illustrations from classical military annals, though interwoven with these were allusions from other sources. Yet, as Mr. Izard claims, 'despite all its borrowed adornment, the book remains Whetstone's own. Though the material is usually conventional . . . his style still has vigour, clarity, and a homely individuality'.

Whetstone fills a wider canvas in *The English Myrror* (1586) divided into three books, each dealing with an aspect of the sin of 'envy', which (as should have been indicated) had a more comprehensive significance in Elizabethan usage than to-day. To its influence he traces the evils in the body politic, and he seeks to remedy these by indicating the proper function of the different elements in the State from the Sovereign downwards. Here once more Whetstone's illustra-

tions of his theme are drawn mainly from Gruget and Du Verdier, though secondary sources are the English chroniclers, Guiccardini, and a mixed multitude through whom Mr. Izard painstakingly threads his way. Incidentally he makes a noteworthy contribution to Marlovian lore. It is usually stated that the chief source of *Tamburlaine*, Part I, was Fortescue's version of Mexia's *Silva*. But Mr. Izard points out that, in certain respects, Whetstone's account of *Tamburlaine*, derived from Gruget, in Book I of *The English Myrror*, is closer to Marlowe's, and that the dramatist may well have drawn in part therefrom. More indirectly of Marlovian interest, through Babington's connexion with Robert Poley, is *The Censure of a Loyall Subject* (1587), in which Whetstone, in dialogue form, relates the execution of Babington and his fellow-conspirators.

Mr. Izard concludes with a chapter on Whetstone's elegies or metrical lives of six contemporaries, of which the most important are the first on George Gascoigne (1577) and the last on Sir Philip Sidney (1587). If Mr. Izard had seen Dr. Prouty's recent study of Gascoigne it probably would have relieved him of any further doubt as to whether Whetstone, who claimed to be an eyewitness of his 'godly and charitable end', was right in placing this at Stamford. The elegy on Sidney may also be accounted accurate in its details of his wounding at Zutphen, for they had come to George from his brother Bernard who had taken part in the battle, and who added a 'brief commendation'.

Mr. Izard's volume would have benefited by some compression. There is occasional overlapping and he lets himself at times go off at a tangent upon some side issue. But his scholarly study will be welcomed and will go far to placing Whetstone's work as a whole in its right perspective. It stretched to the limits the licence allowed by the Renaissance age to borrowers and yet retained an individuality of its own.

F. S. BOAS.

**Stolne and Surreptitious Copies. A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos.** By ALFRED HART. Melbourne and London: Melbourne University Press, in association with Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. xiv + 478. 12s. 6d. net.

This volume, which is the first of its kind, contains an elaborate comparative study of the texts of all the undoubted Shakespearian bad quartos to which there are extant corresponding authentic texts. Mr. Hart explains the texts of 1 *Contention*, *True Tragedy*, *Romeo* 1597, *Henry V* 1600, *Merry Wives* 1602, and *Hamlet* 1603 by a single formula: they are all reported texts, based upon official abridgments of the plays contained in the Shakespearian manuscripts underlying the authentic texts. I have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Hart is right in arguing for the essentially derivative relationship of these bad texts to the corresponding good ones against the view that the former are dependant upon versions anterior to those contained in the latter. The theory that these bad texts substantially depend upon pre-Shakespearian plays or upon Shakespearian first drafts cannot in my opinion be maintained.

One must pay tribute to the vast amount of industrious care entailed in the preparation of this treatise. Mr. Hart bases his argument upon a mass of statistical and other evidence, the collection of which must have demanded patience and vigilance of no common order. If these qualities are also required of the reader who would conscientiously study the book, he is rewarded by having presented for his consideration a case which is in the main sound and convincing.

Mr. Hart shows that as regards vocabulary the relationship between any of the above-named bad quarto texts and the corresponding authentic text or texts is essentially different from that between any recognized source-play and the corresponding Shakespearian play (e.g. *Troublesome Raigne* and *John, Leir* and *Leir*) and also from that between any two distinct but intimately related Shakespearian plays (e.g. 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, 1 and 2 *Henry IV*) or any two distinct plays by any other dramatist (e.g. *Spanish Tragedy* and *Arden*). The number of words found in each bad text but not in the corresponding good text or texts is strikingly small when compared with the number of words found in each recognized source-play but not in the corresponding Shakespearian play or with the number of words found in one Shakespearian play but not in another intimately related to it. Mr. Hart shows this statistically beyond any doubt, suggesting therefore that of each bad text we can say that it is not a source-play and that it is not a Shakespearian play distinct from that in the authentic text or texts. I give this simply as an example of Mr. Hart's method: it is only one of the various points, based on the use of statistics, which he makes to the same effect. And the cumulative impression is very considerable.

Surely everyone will agree with Mr. Hart when he emphatically rejects the suggestion that Shakespeare, re-working the bad texts, carefully extracted from chaotic surroundings words and phrases which he deemed worthy of preservation in other surroundings in his own considered versions, and when he rejects the notion that Shakespeare the reviser would scrupulously remove lines from earlier scenes in the bad texts (supposedly source-plays) and preserve them in later scenes in his own versions. I cannot conceive of such procedure as in the least likely, at any rate to the extent we should have to allow if we regarded the bad texts as anterior plays. Again, Mr. Hart rightly emphasizes the importance of the chapter in which he lists from the bad texts passages which do not convey sense until reference is made to the corresponding passages in the good texts: this argument decisively indicates the priority of these passages as found in the authentic texts (though in itself it does not necessarily indicate the priority of the relevant authentic texts in their entirety).

In my own study of the bad quarto of *Hamlet* I came to the conclusion that, while its text is almost completely dependant ultimately upon the Shakespearian version underlying Q2 and F, there are stray reminiscences of the pre-Shakespearian *Hamlet*—e.g. phrases not found in the good texts but closely resembling phrases in Belleforest. Such phrases were imported into the bad text, I believe, in exactly the same way as were phrases from other plays—*Spanish Tragedy*, *Twelfth Night*, etc. I am happy to find that Mr. Hart holds that this is possible (pp. 391-2), though he does not investigate the matter. It is, I think, of some interest: one may be convinced that a certain bad text is almost entirely dependant on a corresponding extant authentic text, and yet if one finds in the bad text a phrase or two which can be referred with certainty or probability to a pre-Shakespearian stage of the play's history, one may perhaps learn something worth knowing about Shakespeare's process of reworking.

There are one or two features of Mr. Hart's book about which I am not entirely comfortable. For one thing, he treats *Taming of a Shrew* as a corrupt version of a non-Shakespearian source-play and thus places it (apart from the fact of its being corrupt) in the same category as *Troublesome Raigne* and *Leir*: furthermore, the statistics which he draws from *A Shrew* in his vocabulary tests agree quite well with those which he draws from these other two texts. And yet I am convinced that *A Shrew* is not in the same category as these. Evidence for



this assertion, adduced as long ago as 1850 by Samuel Hickson, is of exactly the same kind as that which in Chapter XIII of his book Mr. Hart uses to show the dependance of the bad quarto texts on those of the corresponding authentic editions: certain passages take on full meaning only when reference is made to the corresponding passages in *The Shrew* as found in the folio—this I believe to be quite firmly established. For my own part, I hold that *A Shrew* is a report based on a Shakespearian first draft: I cannot but be disconcerted, therefore, to find that his vocabulary tests permit Mr. Hart to regard it as a non-Shakespearian source-play.

Again, Mr. Hart pays a good deal of attention to the official abridgment of plays in Shakespeare's day. Basing his argument on contemporary references to two-hour performances, he holds that for acting purposes each of Shakespeare's plays was cut to a maximum length of about 2,400 lines. This means that for example the folio texts of *Hamlet* and *Lear* cannot represent acting versions—they are too long. I believe in the evidence which has been brought forward to show that these texts do in fact ultimately depend on prompt-copy. Now they omit certain passages which are generally, and very reasonably, regarded as cuts: Mr. Hart himself (p. 132) allows that the omission of IV. iii. from *F Lear* 'may be part of an official abridgment'. Why should they omit some passages which were cut in performance and retain others which on Mr. Hart's view must also have been cut in performance? Mr. Hart states frankly that he has no answer to this question: and until an answer is produced many students will probably continue to believe that *F Hamlet* and *Lear* as they stand represent acting versions. As Dr. Greg says in his *Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* (p. 96), 'The evidence does not force us to believe that all performances were restricted to anything like two hours: we know that some given at court lasted much longer'.

There are one or two slips in Mr. Hart's book. On p. 2 it is stated that the allusion to Essex in *Henry V* occurs in the opening chorus, and on p. 47 that Professor Dover Wilson's edition of *Hamlet* is published by the Clarendon Press. But such errors are not frequent.

In spite of disagreement on certain points I must reiterate my belief that Mr. Hart's main thesis is sound. The texts of the bad quartos are substantially derived from the corresponding authentic Shakespearian texts, and are not source-documents or first drafts. Other critics have come to this conclusion with respect to individual bad texts. Mr. Hart has demonstrated it clearly with respect to the whole group, using in places methods which he was himself the first to apply. He is to be congratulated on the successful conclusion of an intricate and arduous task.

G. I. DUTHIE.

**Urbane Travellers, 1591-1635.** By BOIES PENROSE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. Pp. x+251. 18s. 6d. net.

Mr. Boies Penrose is well known as an amateur of seventeenth-century travel literature, and in his *Sherleian Odyssey* he gave us an attractive study of three picturesque brothers whose careers carried them overseas. Here we have the story of seven more 'worthies' to whom the author claims justice has not been done: they are known rather than read. Fynes Moryson was a younger son who, like George Sandys, travelled after he left the University as part of his education. A diplomatic mission took Sir Thomas Herbert to Persia. Thomas Coryate was a 'character' who achieved his ambition of riding upon an elephant and



visiting the Great Mogul. Not quite so successful, yet travelling in the same tradition, was William Lithgow, 'cut-lugged Willie', author of the *Rare Adventures*, which have their parallel to-day in the more sensational volumes published by journalists who betake themselves to the Sahara or Gobi or the Cannibal Islands with the simple purpose of writing a book on their return. John Cartwright, the preacher, is more difficult to classify, for it never appears exactly why he was abroad, although there was an occasion when he shipped as chaplain on board a merchantman bound for the Arctic. Sir Henry Blount, too, fails to seize the imagination and establish himself as a personality.

The seven have this in common, however, that they visited Mediterranean Europe, the Near and some of them even the Middle East, and bring us back an entertaining, sometimes even a horrifying, picture of men and manners of the day. All alike travelled because they wished to travel, and if by their day intellectual curiosity had taken the place of the pilgrim's religious zeal, it was merely that a new way of rationalizing an age-old impulse of the human spirit was dictated by the times. It is perhaps to be deplored that there was already a didactic literature of the technique of travel, that is to say of what the traveller ought to observe and learn. These manuals turned his attention almost exclusively to the governing and military classes of the lands he passed through, and to the architectural and other wonderful works of men's hands. The natural landscape and the peasant masses of the population were alike ignored, save where one or the other intruded itself by being especially barbarous or violent or beastly. Mr. Penrose employs the narrative method, assisted by copious extracts from the seven travellers' own writings, and the cumulative effect of their experiences is very striking. Travel through the Germanic lands, and even as far as Bohemia (to and from which, very little earlier, John Dee and Edward Kelly had conveyed their wives and a tribe of little children without mishap) was fairly safe and comfortable, but beyond the Alps, and within Mahommedan lands the danger of death from personal violence was only matched by the danger of death from disease. Fynes Moryson lost a young brother in the Levant, Tom Coryate never lived to return from India: yet the day was approaching when to be an 'urbane traveller' was the rule rather than the exception, and no young gentleman's education was complete until, with his tutor, he had completed the Grand Tour. These were the path-makers.

E. G. R. TAYLOR.

**The Truth of Our Times: Revealed out of one Man's Experience, by way of Essay.** By HENRY PEACHAM. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1638 with an introduction by Robert Ralston Cawley. New York: published for the Facsimile Text Society by Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. Pp. xxiv (introduction)+x+203. 13s. 6d. net.

No other work by Henry Peacham approaches the merits of his *Compleat Gentleman*, but there is still something to be said for reprinting this little volume of essays and, as their author would have expressed it, 'vindicating from dust and moaths' one man's experience of his age.

Neither the man nor the experience was in any sense remarkable. Versatile rather than brilliant, Peacham accomplished nothing that was not mediocre in the many branches of the arts he attempted: his musical compositions were what he called 'weak', his poetry is all forgotten, and the only one of his drawings that is remembered, an illustration for *Titus Andronicus*, owes its survival to the fact

that it was the first rather than the best of its kind. Nor was his career of any greater distinction; his lot in life was one with which a Victorian governess would probably have sympathized. He tried teaching for a livelihood, but found it both laborious and ungrateful. 'The Master becommeth more servile than their servants', he complains, and is held responsible for all the failings of his charge:

If hee falls in climbing a Dawes nest, his Master is in fault; if hee bee asked a question at the Table by a stranger, and is dumbe, his Mother swells, and tells his Master, hee loseth his time, and doth no good.

Peacham abandoned the profession for ever, which was understandable, and adds a dry recommendation in this section of his book that 'large and sufficient stipends' should be provided at public cost for those who find themselves 'able to endure it'. If Sir John Hawkins is to be believed, he ended his long and disappointed life writing penny books for children. Yet in wandering about Europe and in trying his hand at this and that in England he accumulated much experience and some wisdom, and he turns them to good account in the mixture of personal anecdote and criticism of contemporary manners which fills his books.

Much of the material of *The Truth of our Times* is familiar enough. Great men were as dull, scholars as ill dressed, young men as neglectful of their studies as they are in any age. But sometimes Peacham offers some interesting first-hand observations of his own: he shared, for instance, the contemporary belief that the world was decaying and men were getting feebler and smaller, and adds by way of proof that 'the shooting-Buts in Countrey Townes have lost much of their length since the beginning of Q. *Elizabeths* reigne'. Similarly, his criticisms of the extravagance of the fashions of his day are accompanied by details gleaned from a Semster in Holborn of the excessive prices paid for bands and shoe roses, and by accounts of the various styles of hat then worn—'some with crowns so high that beholding them farre off, you would have thought you had discovered the *Teneriffe*'. The interest of the book rests largely upon such information, and one wishes there were more of it. In addition, Peacham has a wit and a charm which give a mild distinction to what he says, and his complaints of life's hardships are always redeemed by some lively or caustic turn of phrase which makes them memorable. If young men are to make unfortunate marriages Peacham will characterize the lady as 'some snoute-faire young thing not worth a groat'; if patronage is to be criticized he will maintain that a man 'must get him a paire of leaden shooes, if he meanes to attend upon so long and tedious hopes'; even if he sees a friend in the London streets, the greeting will be 'Good Lord are you alive yet'! This quality makes him more than a mere presenter of fact, an early experimenter in the science of Mass Observation; for in his book something of the actual life of his age can still be felt. Its running title, *Experience of these Times*, is certainly a just one.

The text of this reprint is that of a copy in the Huntington Library. It is attended by the usual discomforts of facsimiles—illegibility and smudgy printing; the one misprint of the original is not corrected. But Mr. Cawley has provided an admirable and stimulating introduction which will be of value to all students of Peacham.

ROSEMARY FREEMAN.

**John Ray, Naturalist. His Life and Works.** By CHARLES E. RAVEN. London: The Cambridge University Press. 1942. Pp. xx + 502. Price 30s. net.

The name of John Ray is little known compared with that of Gilbert White. There is no doubt that Ray was much the more important of the two, because of his systematic approach to natural history, his wide range and his power of observing facts of fundamental significance. He has not been unhonoured, as the Ray Society was founded in 1844 and has up till now published over a hundred volumes. A life of him by Samuel Dale of Braintree was printed in *A Compleat History of Europe for the Year 1706*, and printed again from a manuscript in the Bodleian by Dr. R. W. T. Gunther in *Further Correspondence of John Ray* (1928). Between these dates his *Philosophical Letters* (1718), edited by William Derham, his *Select Remains* (1760), with a life by Derham, his *Memorials* (1846), and his *Correspondence* (1848) had appeared. Other memoirs of him have been written, and estimates of his work as a botanist are of course given in well-known books such as S. H. Vines's *Makers of Modern Botany*. But no account of Ray at all adequate to his achievements had been written until the present volume was published with the aid of a grant from the Royal Society.

John Ray is a substantial volume gathering together all that is known of the great naturalist and containing detailed accounts of his many books. It is a work which probably no one except the Master of Christ's was equipped to write. Dr. Raven is himself a naturalist who has collected (he tells us) 'nearly all the plants, birds and insects that Ray records and often in the same localities'; and, what is important for one who has to discuss a seventeenth-century scientist holding a deep if simple religious belief, he is able to understand Ray's theological outlook. Dr. Raven, like Ray, has been influenced by the Cambridge Platonists. Ray saw in the loveliness of nature something which supported his religion, and not something to be suspected as a possible snare to a devout life, though to him, as to all his contemporaries, nature's primary purpose was its utility to man.

Ray was born at Black Notley in Essex in 1627 and died there in 1705. He was the son of a blacksmith, and (as happened to several men in the seventeenth century who became eminent) his ability was discovered and encouraged by people of education in his native place. Two successive Rectors of Black Notley seem to have taken an interest in him, and he went to a good school at Braintree. After being admitted to Trinity College, Cambridge in May 1644 he entered Catharine Hall in June, but transferred to Trinity in November 1646, where he and Isaac Barrow worked under the same tutor. Dryden, who later in life had with Ray a common friend in Walter Moyle,<sup>1</sup> entered Trinity in 1650; Isaac Newton entered in 1661. John Wilkins was Master from 1659 till 1660. In 1649 Ray was elected a Minor Fellow. Two years later he was appointed lecturer in Greek, and in the next year a mathematical lecturer and tutor. He made his first long journey, spending some time in Derbyshire and North Wales, in the late summer of 1658. In 1660 he was ordained, and in the same year published his *Catalogus Plantarum Circa Cantabrigiam*. This book, to which Appendixes were printed in 1663 and 1685, has still great charm. The plants in and around Cambridge are described in the alphabetical order of their Latin names, selected from the Herbalists, but their English names and their localities are given: e.g.

<sup>1</sup> Moyle who lived much of his life in Cornwall, though at one time he frequented Will's Coffee-House, is referred to three times in Dryden's late writings. He was interested in ornithology and botany and visited Ray at Black Notley with Tancred Robinson.

'*Calamintha Vulgaris*, Common Calamint. By the rode side near Linton. On a bank near the hedge in a close by the highway side adjoining to S. John's Colledge walks'. Ray forfeited his Fellowship in August 1662 through refusing to subscribe to the Act of Uniformity, but he retained his friendships with several Trinity men, among them Francis Willughby, who entered the College as a Fellow-Commoner in September 1652. He was also by bent a naturalist; he was able to give Ray financial assistance and pay for the tours which Ray made with him or others over considerable parts of England and the Continent. Ray's 'itineraries' are printed in his *Select Remains*. They are of considerable interest, and, like his friend Edward Lhwyd, who searched for flowers on Clogwyn on Snowden and the Glyders, he was not intimidated by mountains. Places he visited can also be discovered from his botanical books. From the time Ray left Trinity he stayed frequently with Willughby till Willughby's death in 1672 at Middleton Hall, Warwickshire. In 1667 Ray became a Fellow of the Royal Society, but he refused the Secretaryship ten years later. In 1673 he married a girl of twenty. The marriage was a success, and, on the death of his mother in 1679, he and his wife went to live permanently at Dewlands, a house at Black Notley. Here, in spite of much bad health, and constant pain in his later days, he wrote a number of books on plants, and also volumes on quadrupeds, insects and fishes. His biggest work, *Historia Plantarum*, in three folio volumes (1686, 1688 and 1704), is of most formidable size even for those times. His investigation of the structure of plants and his classification of them are of great importance; but probably only two of his works were much used by the amateur naturalist, his *Catalogus Plantarum Angliæ* (1670 and 1677) followed by his *Synopsis Methodica Stirpium Britannicarum* (1690) and his English version, published in 1678, of Willughby's *Ornithologia*. He drew up a system of plant classification in his *Methodus Plantarum Nova* (1682) in which, for the first time, plants were divided into Dicotyledons and Monocotyledons. He had contributed tables of plants to Wilkins's *Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* (1668), and he supplied lists of plants under the counties to Gibson's edition of Camden's *Britannia* (1695).

Dr. Raven's book is more than a full account of Ray and his work. He gives the modern names of a large number of the more interesting plants, where, without this help, the botanist would often have to spend time correlating the names employed by Ray with those in use to-day.

The books which I have so far mentioned may seem remote from English studies. But in recent years it has been increasingly emphasized that what is called literature does not arise by a kind of spontaneous generation and that some acquaintance with the knowledge which was available at the time is very helpful to the comprehension of the writers of any age. Ray's books are not widely known because most of them are scientific and he elected to write many in Latin, a language which, though very convenient for his purpose of exact description, was, even in his own day, not in general use.<sup>1</sup> Moreover his mind was concrete and not much given to the abstract speculation which might have extended his circle of readers. Probably more than any other scientist of his time he kept to his own special fields of investigation, and did not, like Newton, Boyle and Wilkins, range over what was then the borderland of science or spend his time on such pursuits as the transmutation of metals.

<sup>1</sup> Technical books such as the *Principia* or the pamphlets by Hobbes and the Mathematicians in the discussion, or rather row, over squaring the circle were still often written in Latin.

In addition to his books of description and classification, Ray published *Observations made in a Journey through the Low Countries etc.* (1673)—a not very exciting volume—a *Dictionarium Trilingue* (1675) in which words in English, with their Latin and Greek equivalents, are given to promote greater accuracy, especially among naturalists, and *A Collection of Curious Travels* (1693), a translation of other people's journeys. He showed himself to be a botanist at heart by inserting lists of plants into the *Observations* and *Travels*. In 1692 he had published his *Miscellaneous Discourses*, altered, enlarged in the following year and entitled *Three Physico-Theological Discourses*. In this book, which had its origin in a sermon Ray had preached at Cambridge, he discusses the creation and dissolution of the World. This was a subject much in people's minds at the end of the seventeenth century, partly because of the appearance of Thomas Burnet's *Sacred Theory of the Earth* (1684), which had originally been published in Latin as *Telluris Theoria Sacra* in 1681. Ray had many years before his *Discourse* maintained, like Hooke in his *Micrographia* (1665), that fossils or 'formed stones,' as they were called, were organic in origin. His view was in debate and was not acceptable to Dr. Plot<sup>1</sup> and others. Another edition of the *Physico-Theological Discourses* was published in 1713 after Ray's death. In the meantime John Woodward in his *Essay towards a Natural History of the Earth* (1695) and William Whiston in his *New Theory of the Earth* (1696) had put forward strange views on cosmogony which Ray had dismissed in one of his letters to Lhwyd, saying of Whiston's theory that 'it seems to me pretty odd and extravagant and is borrowed of Mr. Newton in great part'.<sup>2</sup>

There are three of Ray's books which especially concern the student of English. His *Collection of English Proverbs* was printed at Cambridge in 1670 and reprinted in an enlarged form in 1678. He used books for the compilation of this collection, but he must have gathered many of the proverbs direct from the ordinary people he met in his travels.<sup>3</sup> In this way he also acquired much material for his *Collection of English Words* (1674), for he tells us that he could not 'but take notice of the difference of dialect and variety of local words (for so I will take leave to call such as are not of general use) in divers counties by reason whereof in many places, especially of the North, the Language of the common people is to a stranger very difficult to be understood'. His friends sent him words at his request with the result that a small book was produced which Skeat, who edited it for the English Dialect Society in 1874, calls 'the most important book ever published on the subject of English dialects' before the nineteenth century. Honesty and modesty were outstanding features of all Ray's work. Both are shown in the generous acknowledgements he always makes of the help he had received. It is also characteristic of him that he was not afraid to print 'slovenly and dirty words', for which he apologizes in the second edition of the *Proverbs*. A fuller edition of the *Collection of Words* was published in 1691.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Plot says in his *Natural History of Oxfordshire* (1677) that he does not intend more than a friendly debate. He had investigated formed stones 'according to the wishes and advice of those Eminent Virtuosi, Mr. Hook and Mr. Ray'.

<sup>2</sup> John Woodward, who held with Ray that fossils were originally organic, founded the Woodwardian professorship of Geology. William Whiston was Newton's successor as Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge. 'He confirmed the narrative in Genesis on Newtonian grounds, explaining the deluge by collision with a comet.' *D.N.B.*

<sup>3</sup> Ray's book 'still remains one of the best and most useful compilations . . . it is annotated, as no former collection had been; and the notes, learned, leisurely, and genial, are still invaluable for the study of dialect and folk-lore'. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs* (1935).



In the Preface he explains that since the first edition his Trinity friend Francis Brockesby had supplied him with a 'large catalogue of Northern words'. He also mentions Sir Thomas Browne, whom he had met before 1665.

Lastly there is Ray's most popular book, *The Wisdom of God manifested in the Works of the Creation*. This was published in 1691 and reprinted, each time with additions, in 1692, 1701 and 1704. It continued to appear throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In it Ray turns to a general exposition of organic life and attempts to see nature as a coherent whole. The book contains observations on such a large number of natural phenomena that it is hardly possible to summarize it. Ray explains in his Preface that 'by Virtue of my Function, I suspect myself to be obliged to write something in Divinity, having written so much on other subjects. For being not permitted to serve the Church with my Tongue in Preaching, I know not but it may be my duty to serve it with my Hand by writings'.<sup>1</sup> In its purpose the book was related to the *Discourses*, as this purpose is shown in the text at the head of the first chapter: 'How manifold are thy Works, O Lord! In Wisdom hast thou made them all'. *The Wisdom of God* was an important book; for, to quote Dr. Raven, 'it formed the basis of Derham's Boyle Lectures in 1711-12; it supplied the background for the thought of Gilbert White and indeed for the naturalists of three generations; it was imitated and extensively plagiarised by Paley in his famous *Natural Theology* [1802]; . . . He brings to the task qualifications unique in his own day; an exact knowledge of a large range of phenomena . . . a power of judging evidence disciplined by a lifetime of effort . . . a refusal to accept irrational or super-natural interpretations'.

Ray's style in English, though a little stiff, is clear, and as Sir Norman Moore said,<sup>2</sup> 'he had the merit in a scientific writer of expressing himself so that his reader thinks of what is told without noticing the manner of telling'. He has at times even a certain eloquence.

Anyone who has attempted to write a book on the scale and with the wealth of detail of *John Ray* will know that errors, where they exist, can only be discovered by experts, using it frequently over a long period. One may sometimes disagree with Dr. Raven's comments, as where, in a footnote to p. 30, he says that Barrow 'both in verse and prose, is always verbose and fulsome'. The general index is not faultless. Charles Butler and Samuel Butler are given, but not Bishop Butler, whose *Analogy* expounds, Dr. Raven says, 'the implications of Ray's work'.

HUGH MACDONALD.

**Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy.** By GILBERT SPENCER ALLEMAN. Wallingford, Pennsylvania, 1942. Pp. viii+155.

For the purpose of this monograph, Mr. Alleman has examined 241 comedies of the period 1660-1714. His law is drawn from canon law books of the same period, as well as from the standard modern legal histories. Although he has naturally been unable to consult the unpublished records of the ecclesiastical courts, he cites a considerable array of cases accessible in print. From these sources he has written a solid and informative study of his deliberately limited subject. The limitation is somewhat narrower than his title suggests. He has not attempted to

<sup>1</sup> Ray seems to have written his *Persuasive to a Holy Life* (1700), a small book of not much importance, for the same reason.

<sup>2</sup> Craik's *English Prose Selections*.



consider every aspect of Restoration comedy that might reflect the matrimonial law of the time, preferring to concentrate on certain themes—betrothal, irregular marriage, separation—that occur again and again.

He shows that motifs involving betrothal meant more to the original audience than they do to the uninstructed modern reader. Spousals *de presenti*<sup>1</sup> constituted a marriage enforceable in the ecclesiastical courts; so did a simple promise before witnesses if consummation followed. Such contracts supply some favourite complications in the comedies. Perhaps a woman is seduced under promise of marriage; perhaps an alleged pre-contract threatens the union of two lovers, or again, they are happily contracted to each other, but faced with forced marriage to mates of their parents' choice. These situations were addressed to an audience that realized the binding power of the contracts concerned. They are not treated legalistically, however, but so conventionally that it is clear they are taken more from literature than from life. This is only a little less true of the treatment of irregular marriage. Of the comedies surveyed as many as ninety-one introduce clandestine marriage. The subject was exciting Parliamentary concern: the dramatists do not much exaggerate the frequency and ease of stolen weddings among the wealthier classes. Even their tricked and mock marriages were not quite so far from reality as has been supposed. Robert Feilding married Mary Wadsworth believing her to be the wealthy widow Deleau: Mrs. Davenport and Mrs. Manley were seduced by mock marriage, and no doubt Susan Munday was not the only country girl who shared the same fate. Nevertheless, the stage representation of deceptive marriage does not accord with the legal facts. At canon law, marriage depended on consent to espouse a particular person, and error of identity therefore invalidated it. But in the comedies, the victim of impersonation is fast married no less than his fellow entrapped by misrepresentation of rank, fortune or virtue. There, the criterion of valid marriage is whether the clergyman is genuine; the mock marriages are invalid because he is an impostor. This view had no basis in law, though it may have rested on mistaken popular belief as well as stage convention. The termination of marriage, whether by separation or annulment, is handled less often but more freshly; Vanbrugh and Farquhar, in particular, approach it as a problem from real life. Dramatic interest in it quickened with the first dissolutions of valid marriage effected by Parliamentary divorce in 1698-1701. In fine, Mr. Alleman insists that the audience was able to see in the motifs he has explored, some recognizable reflection of social actuality. But, as he insists quite as frankly, the conventional form which these motifs apart from the last so generally take, and the striking legal inaccuracies in some of them, show that their debt to actuality, though greater than perhaps we had thought, remains very much smaller than their debt to comic tradition.

The chief utility of Mr. Alleman's work may prove to lie less in these modest conclusions than in the assistance it offers to the interpreter of particular passages and plays. And yet it has its contribution to more general questions: anyone, certainly, who wishes to examine in fresh detail the serious intellectual criticism of sex and marriage that Professor Dobrée has taught us to detect in Restoration comedy, will have to take some account of it. Its value for that enquiry is diminished, however, by its exclusions. Nothing is said, for example, of episodes which illustrate the legal effects of marriage upon property—nothing of Wycherley's litigious Widow Blackacre, or Congreve's Mrs. Fainall conveying

<sup>1</sup> In which the couple took one another as man and wife, in words of the present tense.

her estate to Mirabel to keep it out of the power of her prospective husband. Awareness of the economic basis of seventeenth-century marriage affords a good additional touchstone for the dramatists' critical realism:<sup>1</sup> it is a pity Mr. Alleman did not exploit the instances of it that come within his province. Further, he might have supplemented and brought together in a separate section his remarks on the debt to comic tradition against which the dramatists' realism must be judged. Indebtedness to *Epicoene* and to Brome is discussed; to Fletcher, mentioned; to Wilkins and Molière, indicated for certain plays. But the boy-bride situation goes back beyond *Epicoene* to Plautus; and that of contract *versus* forced marriage has its equivalent in Terence's *Andria*. For clandestine and mock marriage, Middleton's *No Wit like a Woman's* is important; it was adapted, and his *Trick to catch the Old One* was acted, after 1660. The 'trick' reappears in Mrs. Behn and in D'Urfey. Indeed, many of the comedies studied draw upon ascertained sources; and where this is so, we should be told whether a given motif is repeated from the source, or introduced (though it be from common stock) by the dramatist himself. For the motifs that most require it, the information might have been systematically supplied in the analytical list of the irregular marriages in the plays. This table is worth the twenty pages it fills: one constantly uses it, as well as the admirable index, in working with the book.

The foregoing criticisms indicate certain missed opportunities, and not major faults in what Mr. Alleman has written. In conclusion some minor ones may be remarked, and a few notes added.

The penultimate sentence on p. 43 is defective and unintelligible. On pp. 9, 118, 122, 147, for 'annual', 'uses', 'or', 'Dobrée . . . 120' read 'annul', 'use', 'of', 'Dobrée . . . 121'. Why should Lady Wishfort's waiting woman consistently appear as 'Foibel'? Editions in Congreve's lifetime have 'Foible'. When in the quotation on p. 121 Farquhar mentions Chancery, it is not 'to stress the advantages of working in a court notorious for its delays' but simply to contrast Equity with the 'strict Statute Law' to which he has just referred. *The Humorous Lovers* and *The Triumphant Widow* should not be attributed to Newcastle without referring to Shadwell's share in them—for which see *The Welbeck Miscellany*, No. 1 (ed. F. Needham, and reviewed in *R. E. S.* xii. 244). Further to attest the notoriety of Mary Wharton's abduction (p. 56, n. 90), see a verse pamphlet not noticed by Rollins—*The Restor'd Maidenhead*, 1691, 'occasion'd by an Infant who was the cause of the death of my friend'; a manuscript note on the Bodleian copy points out that the infant is Mary Wharton, and the friend Johnstone. On royal marriages at night (p. 46) cf. also *Camden Miscellany* i. 6; on assignations at Covent Garden Church (p. 47), Otway, *Souldiers Fortune*, I. l. 296 and Ghosh's note; on the ill-repute of matrimonial proceedings (p. 124), Oldham's imitation of Boileau, *Satyr VIII*, where, contrasting men unfavourably with the beasts, he declares that no hind

. . . for Impotence at Rut,  
Did ee'r the Stag into the Arches put.

Finally, the passage (see pp. 109–110) from Southerne's *The Wives' Excuse*, containing 'the germ of the idea' on which Farquhar bases the separation of the Sullens, itself recalls the well-known exclamation in *Marriage à la Mode*—'this is but a kind of heathenish life, and does not answer the ends of marriage!' This is not yet Southerne's and Farquhar's conception; but it is a step towards it, and deserves a place in its history.

HAROLD F. BROOKS.

<sup>1</sup> See the suggestive note in L. C. Knights, *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson*, p. 126, n. 3.

**A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715).** With Special Reference to the Reign of Queen Anne. By WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN and CHLOE SENER MORGAN. Bloomington, Indiana. 5 vols. Vol. I, pp. xvii+524; vol. II, pp. vi+684; vol. III, pp. viii+705; vol. IV, pp. xi+381; vol. V, pp. xiv+487. 1934-1942.

With every decade the task of the research student is being made easier by the labours of the bibliographer. Whether this will bring forth a nobler generation of scholars than the last remains to be seen; but few of those who have grown grey, or who are beginning to go grey, in eighteenth-century studies would not have been grateful if this vast work which Professor Morgan and Mrs. Morgan of Indiana have just completed had been available to them at their setting out. Here, at any rate, is a notable guidebook for future travellers through the early decades of that century. It is indeed so exhaustive as to be less a Baedeker than a street directory, and its very scope will probably prevent it from being abused by the young postgraduate student. Nothing is ultimately more valuable to such a student than that miscellaneous knowledge of his period which he acquires by feeling his way from one book, and one author, and one topic to another; and nothing is more dangerous at his setting out than to give him a comprehensive list of books which will encourage him to suppose that he can deal with his subject satisfactorily by confining himself to those books which have an immediate bearing upon it. To that Professor Morgan is entitled to reply with Sidney, 'But what, shall the abuse of a thing make the right use odious?' He has, in fact, a better answer. He is well aware that in the period covered by this bibliography, when, as he remarks in the preface to his first volume, literary men were statesmen, and statesmen men of letters, '... the historical and literary elements are intertwined'. In his two first volumes, therefore, he has listed year by year (vol. I, 1700-07; vol. II, 1708-16) the books and pamphlets of the period dealing with political, economic, and religious matters, as well as 'literature' in the more restricted sense of poetry and *belles lettres*. Some form of rationing was necessary, and as this is a Bibliography of British History much of the verse has had to be omitted, though many curious pieces are included. To anyone familiar with the reign of Queen Anne it will not be surprising that some limit had also to be set on the entries bearing upon religious matters, church history, and so on; but a count of the entries in six pages chosen at random from 1712 shows that of the fifty items listed twenty-six deal directly with religious topics. The most regrettable restriction is perhaps in the field of Irish, Scottish, and Welsh affairs. To deal with the history of those countries on the same scale as the editors have dealt with English history would have added enormously to their labours, and very considerably to the size of the bibliography; but it is in those fields that bibliographical information is most likely to be needed by the historian.

It is now twenty-three years since Professor Morgan, in his *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne* (1920), promised to publish 'a comprehensive bibliography of the reign of Queen Anne'. The first volume appeared in 1934, and since then he has continued, with the help of Mrs. Morgan and various students of Indiana University, to discover, file, and arrange a steadily accumulating mass of material. Inevitably, difficulties of arrangement and selection became apparent as the work proceeded, and a desire for completeness drove him to plan on a larger scale than he had originally intended. The third volume deals with 'Source Materials published in 1717 and later', 'Periodicals, including Newspapers and Annuals, 1700-1715', 'Drama', and 'Secondary Materials'. ('Source Materials' carry the story down to 1745,

and 'Secondary Materials' run roughly from 1745 to the present day.) In the Preface a fourth volume was promised, which would deal with unpublished manuscript materials in the principle archives of Western and Central Europe, and contain a comprehensive index to the whole work. This volume duly appeared, but by that time it had been found necessary to plan for a fifth. With its publication last year the work was at last complete. In this final volume will be found supplementary entries to vols. I-III (pp. 1-141), and the Index to the first three volumes (pp. 142-487). The fourth volume—very sensibly—carries its own separate index. Some rough idea of the scope of the bibliography may be gathered from the fact that under the words 'Essay' and 'Essays' there are 251 entries; under 'Dialogue', 54; 'Shortest Way', 17; 'Secret History', 35; and 'Secret Memoirs', 11. The entries for Defoe and Swift, the two giants among the pamphleteers, are of course extensive; but such minor writers as Charles D'Avenant (43 entries), William Pittis (24), Charles Povey (15), and John Tutchin (29), are fully represented.

In offering some criticisms of this work I am fully conscious of its great value to students (it cannot fail to extend the knowledge of the most erudite), and of the immensity of the task which Professor Morgan undertook to perform. From time to time in the prefaces to the various volumes he permits himself some good-natured groans at the weight of the burden he is carrying; and in the preface to the final volume he quotes some words from the disarming statement with which Dr. Johnson offered his *Dictionary* to the world. The writer of dictionaries, Johnson remarked, is 'doomed to remove rubbish and clear obstructions from the path through which Learning and Genius press forward to conquest and glory, without bestowing a smile on the humble drudge that facilitates their progress'. Professor Morgan's labours deserve very much more than a smile of acknowledgment; and since, after all, they will be useful, not so much to genius as to other humble drudges in the academic field, we had better express our gratitude to him with the fullness and frankness which he well deserves. In pointing out some mistakes and some defects, I do not forget that I am reviewing a work running to more than 2,750 pages.

There is some evidence that the works cited have not always been very carefully examined, and entries are therefore occasionally misleading. In vol. II, p. 8 the title-page of a translation of Boileau's *Lutrin* is correctly quoted, but the translation is attributed to Nicholas Rowe. It would have required only a slight examination of the work to show that Rowe only recommended this translation, which was, in fact, the work of John Ozell. In III, 364 and V, 106, it is again attributed to Rowe, and on both occasions called *Lutrine*. Other statements about Rowe's works show a lack of familiarity with the dramatic output of the period or the reliability of its literary historians. In the entry for *The Fair Penitent* (III, 496) Chetwood is quoted for the statement that the play was first performed in 1699, and this is taken so seriously that after recording the date of the first edition, viz. 1703, the editors add the words, 'possibly 1699'. But Rowe's first play, *The Ambitious Stepmother*, was produced in 1700: Chetwood is simply wrong, as he often is. On the same page, in the entry for his second play, *Tamerlane*, we are told: 'Rowe's influence continued for at least half a century and his version of Shakespeare was long preferred to the original'. What Rowe's version of Shakespeare can mean I have no idea. To his *Lady Jane Gray* a note is appended: 'His last tragedy. Clarence [the author of a work called *The Stage Cyclopaedia*, 1909] says: "Partly based on an unfinished play

on the same subject by Edmund Smith"'. But Rowe says so himself in the preface to his play. Incidentally, he spells the name 'Gray', not 'Grey' as given here. In vol. V, p. 106, he is credited with translating De la Bruyère's *Characters* and Quillet's *Callipaedia*. He did not, in fact, translate la Bruyère, and he translated only the first book of *Callipaedia*: again the editors seem to have relied on the title-page, which is, perhaps intentionally, misleading. He did not translate Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (V, 106), but only the episode of Glaucus and Scylla. His translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, dated here 1710-17, was published by his widow in 1719. In vol. II, p. 508, some verses entitled *Maecenas*, addressed to the Earl of Halifax, are said to be 'sometimes ascribed to Nicholas Rowe'. They are certainly his, and are printed as his in eighteenth-century editions of his works; the verses are so dull that no editor would claim them for Rowe for any other reason than that he wrote them. I have not, of course, subjected many authors in the bibliography to so close a check as I have given for the entries for Rowe, but I have tested a number of others. I therefore hasten to add that they emerge from the test much more successfully: Rowe appears to have been unlucky. In general, it must be said that the section on 'Drama' is less satisfactory than other parts of the work.

The bibliography of periodicals suffers in comparison with the completer list to be found in Mr. Graham Pollard's contribution to the *Cambridge Bibliography*; but many of the notes—for example, that on the *London Gazette*—are excellent and informative. Annotation here is on a generous scale, and usually reliable. In the note on John Tutchin, however (III, 300), it is stated that according to some of his biographers his death took place in the Queen's Bench Prison at the Mint. Reference to Tutchin's *Observer*, 27 September-1 October 1707, makes it clear that he died some days after being set upon by ruffians. Confusion is perpetuated, and even extended, in the entry for Theobald's *Censor*. This is said to have been published thrice-weekly in *Mist's Journal*, from 11 April 1715 to 17 June 1715. This statement appears to have originated from a muddled account in Nichols' *Literary Illustrations*, where the *Censor* essays are said to have appeared in *Mist's Journal* in 1726. They certainly did not, nor could they have appeared in *Mist's* in 1715, for that journal (as the editors themselves note on p. 327) was not started till December 1716. Conscious of this discrepancy they go on to suggest in the same place that there may have been a *Mist's Journal* in existence in 1715; it would have been well, before giving currency to a new ghost-paper, to examine the evidence on which the connection of Theobald's *Censor* with *Mist's Journal* was based. In its original form the *Censor* ran for thirty numbers; it was then dropped, but revived in 1717, when it had a run of sixty-six numbers—ninety-six in all. This is made clear enough in the Bodleian *Catalogue of English Newspapers and Periodicals* which the editors cite; but they have introduced a fresh error by implying that it ran originally for thirty numbers, and thereafter, on its second appearance, for a further ninety-six. A puzzling entry occurs on p. 315, viz. 'Philosophical Transactions—For the months of November and December 1708'. Can this be two odd numbers of the *Transactions* of the Royal Society that have somehow or other been dignified with a special entry? Equally puzzling is an entry in vol. III, p. 184: 'Greg, W. W.—Henslowe's diary, 1576-1609'; there is no note to explain how this has crept in among eighteenth-century diaries.

Enough has probably now been cited to indicate that this bibliography requires checking, and that some errors have escaped the eyes of the editors.



Errors, of course, are to be regretted, but they still leave us here with an ample margin of solid achievement. In a work of this size, too, some misprints are bound to escape the most careful proof-reading. I have noted a few; the references are to the number of each item in the bibliography, and not to volume and page—T 897: for 1759 read 1751 (the date of Warburton's nine-volume octavo edition of Pope's *Works*); U 89: the reference (*Lives of the Poets*, 1753) should be to Theophilus Cibber, not Colley; U 140 and U 367: for Boyer read Bowyer; O 563: for Boyle's read Bayle's; U 465: for Earl of Spencer, read Earl Spencer.

One further correction must be made. In vol. IV, p. 340, the editors list among manuscript materials a transcript of the Diary of Dudley Ryder, 1715-16, given to Birkbeck College, London, by Dr. William Matthews, who published the Diary in an abridged form in 1939. The College library was destroyed by enemy action in May 1941, and with it perished Dr. Matthews' transcript. This the editors could not have foreseen. In closing, it should be stated that this fourth volume alone must have involved an immense amount of painstaking and careful work; it should prove a most valuable aid to the research student.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

**The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction.** By PHILIP BABCOCK GOVE. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. Pp. xiv+445. 23s. 6d. net.

The short title of Mr. Gove's book raises expectations which its contents do not meet. For it does not deal with the *Imaginary Voyages* at first or even at second hand: as the long sub-title sets out, it is *A History of its Criticism and a Guide for its Study, with an annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700-1800*. Nor is this sub-title completely descriptive, for the author is chiefly concerned to trace the recognition of this particular type of fiction as a distinct *genre*, and thenceforward to examine the different sub-divisions of the class which various critics, bibliographers and librarians have proposed. The Imaginary Voyage has, in fact, been employed by writers for many purposes: to soften the edges of a bitter satire, for example, or to lend verisimilitude by its homely details to an extravagant fantasy, or again to carry the reader off to Utopia. It is the gilding of the pill, the bait by which we are lured along some road which we might be unwilling otherwise to travel. Rarely is it an end in itself. *Robinson Crusoe*, the supreme example, found so many imitators that the 'Robinsonade' has become an easily recognizable fictional category, but beyond that no clear-cut or generally acceptable scheme of classification has been proposed. Distinctions between voyages and travels are really artificial, and it is difficult to justify Mr. Gove's omission from his check list of voyages that go 'merely' to the Mediterranean Sea, or are 'thalassic or coastwise', as he terms it, rather than oceanic. A proposal to distinguish between possible and impossible voyages also breaks down. Certainly a voyage to the Moon must be ruled out to-day, but so at one time was a voyage under the sea or beneath the mountains. And if the voyage is in fact only the setting of the author's theme, a classification in accordance with the theme, whether satiric, didactic or fabulous, has been suggested. Such a scheme would not cover the cases in which the Imaginary Voyage is in fact a plausible imitation of a real voyage, written simply because there existed a large reading public for voyages. How, for example, should the *Voyages of Sir John Mandeville*, or of the *Zeni Brothers*, be classified? For they were accepted as authoritative for



a couple of centuries or more, and they do embody some genuine travel records, so that the simple heading 'spurious' would hardly serve.

In his Check List Mr. Gove wisely decides on making no sub-divisions of the voyages into classes. The order is purely chronological, and the period chosen quite arbitrary. It is true that the eighteenth century is the great century of the Imaginary Voyage, even perhaps its Golden Age, since *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver's Travels* display the *genre* in the hands of genius, but from the point of view of the student of literature for whom Mr. Gove is writing, the earlier period is equally important. Nevertheless this painstaking and well-documented study will be found very valuable by everyone who has occasion to make any study of eighteenth-century travel literature, for the real and the imaginary voyage are very closely connected. The reviewer has noticed only one slip. A. Kircher's *Mundus Subterraneus* was a scientific treatise and not a work of fiction.

E. G. R. TAYLOR.

**Guinea's Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century.** By WYLIE SYPHER. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. Pp. x+340. 18s. 6d. net.

Many books have been written on the anti-slavery movement. Professor Sypher's particular field is its literature—Southern's *Oroonoko*, Colman's *Inkle and Yarico*, Hannah More's *Slavery* and the many novels, poems and plays that go with these. Most of it is now forgotten, yet a study of it lets us understand a little better the mind of the century. There are, indeed, a few memorable things: Cowper's, 'I would not have a slave to till my ground', Blake's *Little Black Boy*, and Robinson Crusoe's reflection that Friday has 'the same powers, the same reason, the same affections' as himself, which anticipates by a century and a half the reflection of Huck Finn: 'I do believe he [the nigger Jim] cared just as much for his people as white folks does for ther'n. It don't seem natural, but I reckon it's so'.

The British movement against the slave-trade is not merely the earliest instance of modern propaganda: it is a phase of the enlightenment . . . The insistent disapproval of Quakers, the good works of the dissenting sects, the *caritas generis humani* of the eighteenth-century demand the abolition of the trade; yet the protest is really one in the name of a dry "enlightened" theory, the rights of man. There, in these two sentences taken from the first pages of the book, is the underlying thought of *Guinea's Captive Kings*. The Quakers, Wesley, Granville Sharp and the Abolitionists at the end of the century were animated by a just anger at the fact of slavery and the abominations of the trade. The poets and novelists, though not unaffected by humanitarian ideas, were more strongly affected by the literary and philosophic ideas of the Enlightenment: they created the noble negro, Oroonoko, and the pathetic negro (or negress), Yarico, as the symbols of their faith. To this is due the defects of the literature. Had it kept closer to the facts of negro life and character (and it might well have done so for there were 14,000 negroes in England, and many genuine records of life in West Africa and in the West Indies) it would not have fallen into a slough of sentimentalism.

Professor Sypher begins his book with a long study of Currents of Opinion. It would have been incomplete without it, for he deals here with such works as Newton's *Authentic Narrative*, Wesley's *Thoughts upon Slavery*, Anthony Benezet's *Historical Account of Guinea*, which are more alive to-day than the

literature proper. In fact this part of his work might have been much extended. Some reference to the speeches of Burke, Fox, Pitt and Wilberforce would correct an impression that lingers in the mind after reading the book, that the anti-slavery writers were really rather misinformed about the whole business and talked a great deal of nonsense. In such a study it is not sufficient to chronicle all the books and all the opinions mooted. Some of them are just the flags that lackey the stream: others are the great tides themselves.

On one or two points I do not see eye to eye with Professor Sypher. Speaking of Locke he says: 'To explain slavery, therefore, he must (a little illogically) call in the "just war" theory: "he that conquers in an unjust war, can thereby have no title to the subjection and obedience of the conquered"'. This beautifully reasoned argument enables Locke utterly to ignore the slavery of negroes. "And thus", he concludes, "captives, taken in a just and lawful war, and such only, are subject to a despotical power" ' (p. 77). But surely the whole tenor and tone of Locke's chapter on Conquest shows that he would have regarded the 'war' against the Guinea Kings as unjust. Further, even in a just war, he says, the rights of the victor are limited: he should not enslave the children of the conquered, for instance, or deprive them of their property. When speaking of Burke, too, Professor Sypher seems to me misleading. One might suppose from his remarks (p. 81) that Burke supported Dundas's proposal that the abolition should be gradual. But Burke spoke strongly for Wilberforce's motion in 1789 and 1791. One cannot say why his name does not appear in the 1792 debates: probably he was too much taken up with India and France. After Dundas was successful in blocking abolition by introducing the word 'gradual' Burke sent him a sketch of a negro code he had drawn up long before at a time when abolition seemed chimerical—a sketch embodying regulations that Dundas would never have accepted. No slightest degree of suspicion should be left in the mind that Burke was in any way lukewarm about abolition.

For the material of his later chapters Professor Sypher must have read vast numbers of books not only in order to cull out the apposite passages (often in a four-volume novel there will be only two pages about the negroes) but also to relate what they say to the general outlook of their authors.

In Chapter III he traces admirably the literary history of Oroonoko, Inkle and Yarico and the Two Lovers. Chapter IV deals with the verse. Defoe is the earliest writer of importance against slavery, and one must say this of him even though in one or two of his works he advises the use of negro slaves. (Cf. the *Essay on Projects*, 1698, and *Plan of the English Commerce*, 1728).

The harmless natives basely they trepan,  
And barter baubles for the Souls of Men.

(*Reformation of Manners*, 1702).

Thomson, had he written when the evils of the slave trade were better known, might have been the greatest poet of anti-slavery. Grainger in his *Sugar-Cane* (1764) writes for the most part as if he were a groom choosing horses or a veterinary surgeon prescribing for them, yet he feels some mild regret at their misery:

Give to man  
Of every colour and of every clime,  
Freedom which stamps his image of his God.

I will not follow Professor Sypher through the verse that sinks 'from thought to thought, a vast profound',—Eliza Knipe's *Atomboka and Omaza*, the effusions of

Anne Yearsley, the poetical milkmaid of Bristol, and the schoolgirl contributions to the newspapers.

Apart from such plays as *Oroonoko*, *Inkle and Yarico* and George Colman's *Africans* the drama troubled itself little about the negro question. Its most original contribution is the comic negro of Isaac Bickerstaff's *Padlock*. But there are many fairish novels, and to the bewildered student running his eye over dusty stacks of these forgotten four-volume productions, Professor Sypher provides many a clue. Mrs. Mackenzie's *Slavery* (1790) is a grand total of the deficiencies of 'literary' anti-slavery. *The Negro Equall'd* translated by a negress from the French is as bad, and so too is *Memoirs and Opinions of Mr. Blenfield* (1790). There are some good pages in *Zeluco* by Dr. John Moore: it is 'one of the rare instances in which fiction is not damaged by anti-slavery'. *The Adventures of Jonathan Corncob* receives a star and also Charlotte Smith's *Letters of a Solitary Wanderer*, 'one of the most authentic stories of West Indian life'. The novels listed and briefly commented on run into scores.

Professor Sypher's criticism of all this 'literature' is severe. He distrusts the feeling in Mackenzie's *Julia de Roubigné* because his wife is said once to have exclaimed of him, 'Oh, Harry, Harry, your feelings are all on paper'. He praises the truth of manners in George Colman's *Africans* but is rather reserved about the far greater play, *Oroonoko*, because of its false Africanism. He dwells on the faults of Day's *Dying Negro*, its gaudiness of diction, its Rousseauistic and Romantic sentiment and passes over lightly the humane feeling that informs it. But the spirit of man moves through many channels. It may create poetry and art out of its dreams even though these are so little related to fact as pseudo-Africanism and the Noble Savage. True, there were oceans of mush. But why speak of it as 'literature' at all? The share it had in creating an anti-slavery opinion is another matter. There was some mush in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

In an interesting section Professor Sypher speaks of the counter-offensive, the pro-slavery novels of Richard Cumberland (*Henry*, 1795) and George Walker (*The Vagabond*, 1799). What would these writers have said to W. D. Howells's whimsical speculation? Or is it mush? 'I believe', says a character in *An Imperative Duty*, 'that if the negroes ever have their turn—and if the meek are to inherit the earth they must come to it—we shall have a civilization of such sweetness and good-will as the world has never known yet. Perhaps we shall have to wait their turn for any real Christian civilization.'

W. D. TAYLOR.

**The Later Career of Tobias Smollett.** By LOUIS L. MARTZ. (Yale Studies in English, vol. 97.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. xiv+213. 18s. 6d. net.

Dr. Martz's book is packed with the results of intelligent and minute research. His field is Smollett's activity as editor and compiler, and his object is to trace the effect of these labours on the original work of his later years, the *Travels*, the *Adventures of an Atom*, and especially *Humphry Clinker*. His starting-point is marked by Mr. Herbert Read's protest that to omit, in any estimate of Smollett's literary work, to reckon with his seventeen years' grind for the booksellers is 'as though we were to ignore in Milton's case the twenty years that elapsed between *Lycidas* and *Paradise Lost*'; and though it does not appear that the changes are, in fact, so profound, or the material in which they take place so precious, they are none the less positive and interesting, and we are glad of a closer view of Smollett in his literary factory.

Dr. Martz sees this drudgery in relation to a dominant interest of the eighteenth century, the desire to systematize and make available in a comprehensive and orderly form the results of the expansion of knowledge that had been taking place during the preceding hundred years. There was a demand for compilations, historical, geographical, and scientific, in which accumulated information was 'methodized', and vast undertakings, conducted through a period of years, weighted the shelves. Dr. Martz investigates closely Smollett's work on the first of his tasks, *A Compendium of Voyages* (1756), in order to find out what kind of attention he gave to it, and establishes that his standard of editorial competence was high. He chose his sources with care, wrote some sections himself and revised others, rearranging the material more logically and polishing and condensing the expression. The other compilations are not so closely investigated, but evidence from them figures in the book, and it is apparent that the same sort of care was bestowed upon them. There was nothing perfunctory about Smollett's editorships.

Pot-boiling of this kind, prolonged over seventeen years, must give a permanent bent to the mind that has brought down the game and cut the faggots to keep such large pots boiling for so long. In his three early novels Smollett's quarry had been picaresque adventure, and he had sent his heroes travelling not so much to survey the country as to encounter a larger range of events. Now, however, the interest shifts; the sections of the *Compendium* present a business-like conspectus of the history of exploration, in which the stress lies on geographical and social information and from which the pirates and shipwrecks that diversify the original accounts are eliminated. This bias survived when Smollett, at the end of his life, turned back to the novel. *Humphry Clinker* is liberally seasoned with incident, but the Bramble family do not travel in order to encounter it; they travel in order to survey Bath, London, Harrogate, and Scotland, and to make comparisons, odorous and other. It was also to be expected that so many hundreds of pages of marshalled facts, written and revised, should leave their mark on the writer's style. Smollett learnt the art of 'dexterous epitome, substantial, yet smooth and concise'. There is less expansiveness in his later work than in his earlier, the narrative sentences are simpler, and those that carry a load of fact dispose it into parallel constructions, ascribed in the past to the influence of Johnson, but rather explicable, Dr. Martz thinks, by the nature of the work to be done and the paramount need for density of material and lucid order of statement.

There is a useful chapter on Smollett's *Travels*, in which Dr. Martz explodes Smollett's reputation for classical scholarship by listing his very considerable loans from the guide-book *Roma Antica* and elsewhere, but vindicates his enthusiasm and conscientiousness; and another on the *Adventures of an Atom* in which the various notions that provided the framework for its virulent satire are traced to their probable sources. The most interesting section, however, is that which deals with *Humphry Clinker* and puts it into relation with Smollett's work on *The Present State of All Nations*, an eight-volume compilation, published 1768-9, in which the sections on England and Scotland can be assigned with some confidence to Smollett himself. The failure of this undertaking must have ranked sorely with its irascible editor. No adequate accounts of Scotland existed, and he had not only spent pains on amassing his material and supplementing his sources *con amore* from his personal knowledge, but had achieved a judicious, sober, impartial approach, designed to inspire confidence in his judgment on

both the sister-kingdoms. To the failure of the project was added the disapproval of his Scottish friends, who fell foul of his impartiality; they found, as Dr. Armstrong informed Smollett, that he had 'too much exposed the posteriors of our brothers in the north, and made some undeserved compliments to their neighbours in the south, who have already a comfortable enough share of self-conceit'. Meanwhile Smollett's own views and temper had undergone a change. Dr. Martz makes out a good case for the presumption that the sections on England and Scotland were written as early as 1759-60; at any rate, they precede the embitterment of Smollett's attitude to England by his immersion in controversy on behalf of Bute's administration. When he began *Humphry Clinker* he was not so anxious to be impartial. He was, however, still desirous of enlightening the Southerner as to the merits of Scotland, and the result was that, while thriftily using up the Scottish material from the neglected *Present State*, he took care to contrast it strongly with the human scene south of the Border. These parallels are emphasized. The universal hospitality of Scotland is thrown into relief by the satirical view of 'old English hospitality' provided by the Yorkshire freeholder, and the excellent food of Edinburgh is grateful to palates that have been nauseated by 'London dainties'. The hypercritical Matthew Bramble mellow as he enters Scotland and becomes the astonished admirer of its neglected virtues. Indeed, Dr. Martz thinks that Bramble's eccentricity was primarily devised as a vehicle for the denunciation of English life and character, which would be accepted the more readily if it were the utterance of a sick man and acid humourist. Even Lismahago seems to him to have been shaped, in the first instance, by Smollett's desire to attack England and praise Scotland. Praise of the latter country at the expense of the former would seem to most readers a paradox; therefore it is put in the mouth of a solemn, argumentative, highly eccentric Scot, a dealer in paradoxes. Lismahago makes his first appearance as the travellers are approaching Scotland and his polemics are accepted as a part of his 'humour', amusing in their extravagance. While Matthew Bramble and his party tour Scotland he is prudently withdrawn, and their conversion is effected by their personal experiences of the country, so that when the soldier of fortune reappears at Carlisle, primed with a fresh salvo of ammunition from the *Present State*, they take him more seriously and are half-way to agreement with him.

Dr. Martz does not claim too much for his own line of research. He is concerned with Smollett the historian and compiler, with the extra-literary intentions of his last novel and the skill with which he adapts and applies his materials. Bramble and Lismahago are studied as instruments consciously designed for a didactic and controversial function, and it may well be that it was in this fashion that they originated. The creative vigour that seized on the two characters, the recovered exuberance of comic invention in Tabitha Bramble and Win Jenkins, the solacing measure of idealized self-portraiture in Matthew Bramble are no part of his subject, though he is careful to show himself aware of other aspects of the book that Smollett wrote in the 'nostalgia of final exile'. More than thrift, embitterment and combative national feeling went to it; yet it is interesting to consider that it may have been begun under the stimulus of just those feelings. It would then be as a consequence of the decision to continue his controversy in the guise of fiction that Smollett once more tapped the creative springs of his own talent, and filled a novel, written under the shadow of irremediable sickness, with a sensation of well-being and enjoyment of the reopened vein.



Dr. Martz's book has admirable qualities. It is full of detailed information, much of it new, about a section of Smollett's work that is superficially unattractive and little read, but now proves to have close connections with his most delightful book. The arguments are supported step by step, by close analysis and comparison of texts. This complex material is put before us as briefly and lucidly as possible and in a readable style—no small merit where such masses of evidence were to be sifted.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

**The One Wordsworth.** By MARY E. BURTON. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. Pp. xiv+237. \$3.00; 18s. 6d. net.

Miss Burton makes here a study of Wordsworth's revisions, limited for practical reasons to *The Prelude*, in which every type of revision appears and from which consequently conclusions of general validity may be drawn. For practical reasons again, not every revision has been cited, but enough are considered to correct many popular misunderstandings of their extent and meaning. Apart from detailed discussions, often valuable, of specific revisions, there are more general surveys and summings up. Miss Burton first reviews the history of the printed *Prelude* and shows the motive for her own study: 'No one seems to have made any detailed study of the revisions. Everyone writes as if he knows more about the revisions than he actually does, either vaguely generalizing from a cursory examination of the book [i.e. de Selincourt's edition], accepting the introduction . . . or grasping at occasional lines that appear to illustrate the critic's own preconceived ideas as to what these early manuscripts ought to reveal' (p. 22). This is perhaps too strong; if a personal note may be allowed, this reviewer made a pretty careful study of *The Prelude* for a book to which Miss Burton courteously refers, but, finding that the results merely confirmed conclusions reached on other grounds and, if set out, would double the size of the volume, did not dwell upon them. Professor R. D. Havens's recent critical edition and this book by Miss Burton give both a fair excuse to the indolent to abandon a half-planned separate study and, more valuable and positive, two independent confirmatory judgments. For it does not in fact appear that, as is stated in a footnote on p. 24, Professor Havens 'substantiates the accepted views about the revision': his main thesis, set out in his Preface and elsewhere, is that the revised *Prelude* is on the whole aesthetically better, essentially truthful and honest, and not to be used to maintain any theory of poetical or spiritual ossification or decadence; and this agrees with Miss Burton's conclusions. The most interesting parts of the body of the book are chapter V, in which she discusses the change of perspective, and the growth—or sometimes loss—of understanding caused by 'intervening years', chapter VI, which contains careful collations of different versions of *Vaudracour and Julia*, and chapter VII, which brings out Wordsworth's loyalty and constant affection towards Coleridge, more emphatic in the later revisions—he seems, as she remarks later (p. 227) 'to invest their friendship with a new glamor'.

A self-respecting reviewer must always find at least one slip and one cause for disagreement. The slip may be taken from p. 48, where 'St. James' should clearly be 'King James'; and in the passages quoted on p. 50 it may be that the inserted references to a guiding Providence mean more than 'a greater reverence': they may be indications that Wordsworth, looking back, saw, as others have seen, a pattern in his life not all of his own weaving.

EDITH C. BATHO.



**The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë.** Edited from the manuscripts by C. W. HATFIELD. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. Pp. xxiv+262. 18s. 6d. net.

In 1923 Mr. Hatfield helped to prepare the volume of Emily Brontë's poems edited by Clement Shorter, but almost at once learnt that it was neither so complete nor so textually accurate as he had supposed. This edition fills the gaps and corrects the errors as far as the dispersal of the manuscripts has left it possible, and the interpretation of the poems is rendered slightly less puzzling. The brief essay and suggested reconstruction of the Gondal Story by Miss Fannie E. Ratchford (pp. 14-19) offers a narrative, which though it may be questioned in detail, is both ingenious and possible. For the most important fact about the poems is that, with few exceptions, they are dramatic monologues, and 'Emily Brontë's own voice turns into nonsense the hundreds of pages of Brontë biography based on the subjective interpretation of her poems'. Thus in *Cold in the earth* the MS. reading 'Angora's' for the 'northern' of the 1850 *Poems* would, even without the heading 'R. Alcona to J. Brenzaida', show its connection with the saga, and *No coward soul is mine* also belongs to the Gondal Poems. The question still remains, how far Emily Brontë projected herself into the story and identified herself imaginatively with her characters, or indeed then with herself, for such a passage as the description of ecstasy in ll. 69-88 of No. 190 has a definitely personal note among the surrounding crude horrors and romance. The question is partly but not entirely answered by stanzas 5 to 7 of No. 176. The quality which it was recently fashionable to call escapism is certainly one of the elements in her poetry; so is an imitative Byronism of thought and expression; and with them are mingled sincere feeling, rising to passion, and power.

EDITH C. BATHO.

**The Writings of Arthur Hallam.** Now First Collected and Edited by T. H. VAIL MOTTER. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press. 1943. Pp. xiv+332.

It may be that some fresh inquiry into the relation of the thoughts of A. H. Hallam with those of Tennyson in 'In Memoriam' will yet be made; Mr. Vail Motter goes over the extant authorities and concludes that they have almost all left the matter in a shadowy state. For his part, not forgetting that 'In Memoriam' is in the beginning and end a work of art, he comes to supply as complete a view of Hallam as his writings afford. The chief reason for an edition of them now is the editorial strictness or domestic prejudice of Henry Hallam in the 'Remains' of 1834. Most of those whom the topic concerns have been familiar with that volume or with those which have depended wholly upon it, including the pretty one edited by Mr. Le Gallienne fifty years ago. But Henry Hallam was resolved to exclude a great deal that his son had printed for private circulation in 1830, and from that rare production and other sources Mr. Vail Motter assembles a quantity of prose and verse by A. H. H. in addition to the usual array.

He does not challenge the prevailing estimate of Arthur Hallam's verse; he discerns how it came about that the young man at last adopted the medium of prose. The sonnets, as before, appear the best of these poems; and one or two new ones may vary the selections which patient anthologists make. That which the abrupt ending of Shelley's 'Triumph of Life' drew from Hallam in or about 1831 possesses more impulse, keener mental strokes than most of the rest. But

its author would have desired us to forget it; he was going farther if he could, out of the Night in which he wrote that poem. His 'Theodicea Novissima', an essay probably read to the Apostles on 29 October 1831, represents his strivings, and his 'endeavouring to restore Alfred to better hopes and more steady purposes'. This document, printed in 1834, was subsequently omitted except in one of the editions, and Mr. Vail Motter draws special attention to it, as 'a kind of summation of Hallam's belief and practice, and a suggestive guide to a quality of mind and personality which carried more weight with Tennyson than all the formal philosophical disquisitions in the world'.

For his extensive pursuit of the surviving work of A. H. Hallam, and his useful commentary on the compositions one by one, Mr. Vail Motter commands the name of a valuable editor. The book takes its place on the Tennyson shelf, from which so much is disappearing. The principal improvement to be desired is the thorough correction of the Greek quotations.

EDMUND BLUNDEN.

**The Language of Poetry.** By PHILIP WHEELWRIGHT, CLEANTH BROOKS, I. A. RICHARDS, and WALLACE STEVENS. Edited by Allen Tate. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. Pp. x+125. 12s. net.

The four essays here collected were delivered as lectures at Princeton University in 1941 under the auspices of the Creative Arts Program. Mr. Wheelwright, opening with the consideration of 'Poetry, Myth and Reality', attributes the contemporary impoverishment of response to poetry to the decline in myth and in mythical consciousness observable since Descartes. If the dimensions of human experience be represented geometrically by means of two axes, one of the ego reacting to physical phenomena, the other, at right angles, of the community reacting towards mystery, it will be found that the major philosophical movements of the past three centuries have unduly stressed the former, exalting reason to the exclusion of myth. The effect of this rationalizing process upon poetry has necessarily been detrimental, since poetry, in its primitive form, is inseparable from the communal consciousness and consequently from myth. 'The reason why primitive language is poetry lies in the fact that it is the spontaneous expression of a consciousness so largely, in our sense, mythical', a conclusion confirmed by the example not only of primitive poetry but also of Æschylus and Shakespeare. In abandoning myths for ideologies lacking their transcendental significance, we have weakened our poetic consciousness, upon the revival of which the future of poetry must depend. Mr. Brooks's essay, entitled 'The Language of Paradox', is avowedly 'a piece of special case-making'. By means of examples from Wordsworth, Donne, and Shakespeare he argues that 'paradoxes spring from the very nature of the poet's language; it is a language in which the connotations play as great a part as the denotations'. Such observations recall Coleridge's theory of imagination as 'esemplastic' power reconciling 'sameness with difference', a connection confirmed by the writer in his final sentence: 'We must be prepared to accept the paradox of the imagination itself'. The particular instances cited would appear to corroborate the notion of poetry as 'the language of paradox'; but unless the term 'paradox' is used in a very free sense its general application is conducive to over-subtlety. Mr. Richards throughout the first half of his essay on 'The Interactions of Words' confines himself to somewhat desultory generalizations and inquiries, leading to the

conclusion that 'Language, as understood, is the mind itself at work, and these interactions of words are interdependencies of our own being'. The latter half is devoted to a comparison, of a type familiar to readers of Mr. Richards' other works, between the opening stanzas of Donne's 'Anatomy of the World' and of Dryden's 'Ode to the memory of Mrs. Anne Killigrew'. Mr. Wallace Stevens, under the title 'The Noble Rider, and the Sound of Words', pursues further topics discussed by other writers in the series, more particularly by Mr. Wheelwright. If Plato's figure has any general bearing upon poetry it implies that imagination must adhere to reality since otherwise it will lose its wings. 'What happened, as we were traversing the whole heaven, is that the imagination lost its power to sustain us. It has the strength of reality or none at all.' The decline of nobility in modern art has resulted, on the one hand, from failure to relate imagination and reality, and, on the other, from pressure of reality, this latter revealing itself through the denotative and the connotative forces in words. Space does not allow Mr. Stevens to do more than touch upon the various topics covered in an essay which, despite some diffuseness, deserves careful consideration on the part of poet and critic alike.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

**Shores of Darkness.** By EDWARD B. HUNGERFORD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941; London: Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. x+314. 20s. net.

This book is an example of American research at its best. It has all the thoroughness which we have learned to expect, but it produces none of that feeling of depression which affects one when much labour has been expended on a result which is of no interest to either researcher or reader. Professor Hungerford has conducted a piece of exact enquiry into the work of the speculative mythologists of the latter half the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth. But he then proceeds to apply the results of his research to the illumination of the work of writers very much more important than the mythologists. His research, that is, is a means to an end and not an end in itself.

He deals first with Blake's *Albion*, and, though the specialist in Blake may hold that Professor Hungerford over-simplifies, the ordinary reader is much too thankful for any simplification to be over-critical. The chapter on *Endymion* is extremely interesting and, I think, convincing, as is the greater part of the chapter on *Hyperion*, though in advancing the idea that Keats was moving towards a British epic Professor Hungerford is perhaps moving, much as he does later over the second part of Goethe's *Faust*, into a region of speculative reconstruction where many readers will hardly think it worth while to follow him.

Of the two chapters on Shelley that on *Prometheus* is full of interest and illumination. In that on *Adonais*, though no one can help returning to the poem with much quickened interest and insight after reading it, Professor Hungerford shows signs of erecting an Aunt Sally for the purpose of knocking it down. He assumes that Shelley's design was of extreme complication and then shows that he only partially succeeded in executing it. The truth may be that Shelley succeeded fairly well in executing a less complicated design.

Professor Hungerford writes a pleasant style, perfectly lucid, equally free from the verbose and the trite, and diversified by occasional flashes of a refreshing dry humour.

M. R. RIDLEY.

**Proceedings of the British Academy, 1940.** London: Published for The British Academy by the Oxford University Press. 1943. Pp. xii + 530. 30s. net.

This volume majestically takes its place with the twenty-five other *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Much of it is completely beyond the ken of the present reviewer—the long dissertation on 'Two Celtic Waves in Spain' by P. Bosch-Gimpera and 'The Boundary Line of Cymru' by Sir Cyril Fox. Here are the notes of a lecture the late Professor W. R. Scott intended to give on the present state of Adam Smith scholarship, and Mr. G. F-H Berkeley surveys the whole field of the Italian Risorgimento, testing the value of the various kinds of documents, distinguishing between the historians, and giving us briefly but with the authority of one who has started from zero, his views of Pio Nono, Metternich, and Ferdinand II of Naples. Professor Laird in 'The Speculative Limits of Humanism' sets out to prove that a man may have cognizance of something not himself; or if not to prove, at least to snatch the Scottish verdict of *non-proven*. Our sensations may be our prison-window as well as our prison. Man makes his science but does not make the nature he is trying to express. To say that the pillar-boxes of Great Britain resemble each other in respect of redness, is not merely a piece of mind-spinning. He allows the *prima facie* mannishness of the beautiful, the true and the good, so much so that at times one wonders if he is not weighting the scales too much against himself. Yet, he points out, there is a such a thing as a finer taste, a more delicate conscience, and it is not sufficient to account for this by the fact that we have satisfying emotions, or that we are experts on these matters, or that we have the cheers of the gallery with us. Child marriages need not be a good thing because the *pardahs* think so. 'When we speak of good taste or of good conscience, of right judgement in aesthetics or of right conduct in ethics, we invariably think of something trans-subjective, impartial, with a claim to universal validity.' He concludes: 'Our human minds have certain high privileges, but there is no occasion for obliterating these privileges by personifying or humanizing *everything*. There is nothing to forbid the belief that other beings may have similar or greater privileges. The most we can say on empirical grounds is that we have not met such beings'. Might not one add the words of the poet?

Let him go weep  
O'er his own wounds:  
Seraphim will not sleep  
Nor spheres let fall their faithful rounds,  
Still would the youthful Spirits sing.

Of the literary contributions Mr. M. R. Ridley's 'On Reading Shakespeare' has already been reviewed (*R.E.S.* Vol. 17, p. 250). My one remark is that short of Garrick and Mrs. Siddons on the stage, there is nothing to touch reading a play aloud right through. Away with the lamp, away for the time being with dictionaries and notes encompassed about the teacher *bis ans hohe Gewölb' hinauf!* Read aloud he drops from the clouds like 'feather'd Mercury'.

Mr. J. Crofts in the Warton Lecture contributes a sensitive study of Wordsworth. Is it not strange, he asks at the beginning, that Wordsworth who had so many affinities with the mystical poets of the seventeenth century, should have come at the end of the sceptical and sophisticated eighteenth century? Is it not fortunate, he asks in his last sentence, that he came when he did, that is, at a time when the poet no longer as a matter of course, saw his spiritual vision

through Isaiah's dream and the lilies and palm trees of the Song of Songs? Between the two questions he leads us by winding paths which give many new glimpses. He shows us something we had never seen before, for instance, by giving some extracts from the journals of obscure Welsh preachers and Cromwellian troopers, which tell of spiritual experiences resembling Wordsworth's. It is true that he sometimes brings me to a halt. Does not Thomson on a sunset do more than reveal 'how just, how beauteous the Refractive Law'? Could Beattie's Minstrel really have written 'The Evening Walk'? Is not the treatment of light and sound in it beyond him? But I finish my perambulation with a finer sense than before of the spiritual conversion Wordsworth underwent somewhere between 1791 and 1795. Yet I should like to give it as my opinion that Wordsworth was a mystic by nature. The experience he had when, walking round the lake, his soul put off her veil and stood naked as in the presence of her God (*The Prelude*, Book IV), occurred before he went to France. And he might have written some of the mystical passages in *The Excursion* had he never gone there. It is easy to be a mystic in the mountains. After a long day's walk with little to eat or drink, everything swims before the eyes and one feels light and lifted up: that is, one has an experience of the kind called by the mystics 'the dark night of the soul'.

Sir Herbert Grierson in his lecture on Carlyle, a Master Mind, is chiefly concerned with the Carlyle of *Past and Present*, *Latter-Day Pamphlets* and *Shooting Niagara*. He holds that he was a true prophet down to *Past and Present*, but that thereafter the voice of the Lord left him: he became in the words of G. M. Hopkins (who, by the way is repeating a quip fairly common about 1880) 'terribly earnest but never serious'. He lost any faith he had ever had in the power of the common man to act, whether Quashee among his pumpkins or the twenty thousand starving sewing-maids who could not sew. He sneered at Parliamentarism no less than Hitler. He would have had the Queen choose some Friedrich or Friedrich Wilhelm from her aristocracy, and set him to rule our colonies. He welcomed the victories of Bismarck. Germany's becoming the Queen of Europe was the hopefulest sign for him. He had not the prophetic sense to see that the United States of America under Lincoln was proving that democracy could ride out a storm. Yet we finish the lecture thinking of Carlyle with more reverence than ever. He fought in the dust and heat of the day against *Laissez Faire* and Profit and Loss doctrines and all the misery that had come from them. We have no right to take his hard-dinted armour, cast it over Hitler's head or Mussolini's and judge him by these scarecrows. He was a champion of justice. In spite of his harshnesses there were deep pities and sympathies in him. Above all he had a profound sense of the spiritual destiny of mankind and quickened all the great minds of his age in Britain and America to it. He was not a believer in the creed of any church, but he said, 'In the great hand of God I stand', as Calvin and Knox would have said it.

In an *Atlantic Monthly* of 1880 a New Englander tells how he came on a little community ruled by a black man—the son of an African king—with all the efficiency of Abbot Samson. Among his books was a battered *Sartor*. He told his visitor that above all he would have liked to hear Carlyle and Lincoln conversing together. One cannot help asking after reading Professor Grierson's lecture: could not the two lions have lain down together—the lion of action and the lion of thought, each with the Bible in the marrow of his bones? Though Carlyle, misinformed, had not the sense to see it, Lincoln after all was actually his Hero



in action. He not only held the tiller firm but drove his ship hard through the tempest. Carlyle was certainly right so far about Heroes that when Moby Dick is about, Captain Ahab must come on deck.

The Fragment called the *Fight at Finnsburh* discovered by George Hickes at the beginning of the eighteenth century and the Episode in *Beowulf* sung by the Scop of Hrothgar (ll. 1068-1159) is a battle-ground of Old English scholarship. No two scholars agree about their relation to one another, and no two accept the same texts. Twenty-two emendations at least are necessary in the fifty lines of the *Fight* before it becomes legible. In his lecture on *Finnsburh* Mr. Ritchie Girvan grapples with this Grendel. It would be impossible here to examine it in detail even if I had the knowledge and ability. It scrutinizes every aspect of the discussion from Hickes's methods to patronymics in *Beowulf*, and is built on vast under-deeps of learning: *heal-ærna mæst*.

Mr. Girvan makes three chief points:

(1) From the language and style he concludes that the *Fragment* was composed about the time when the only extant text was written down, viz., in the eleventh century, four hundred years roughly after the great Old English poet had composed his epic, *Beowulf*. On the face of it there is not much likelihood of agreement between the story suggested in the *Beowulf* Episode and that of the *Fragment*.

(2) *Beowulf* is an epic, an artistically composed epic. The poet suggests atmosphere and background: he interweaves his episodes of Hnaef and Finn and Ingeld so that they may cast reflecting gleams on the main theme. The *Fight at Finnsburh* is a Lay. 'In a lay we have a given situation which may develop internally but which is complete in itself. There is no room and no desire to dwell on origins, on ultimate results, on effects in the minds of actors, or to develop the dramatic element; such things at the best occur in brief allusions. . . . The poet himself defines his subject—never did sixty retainers acquit themselves better or better requite their liege-lord Hnaef'.

(3) Mr. Girvan in a convincing argument identifies Hunlafing with Hengest. This is a striking new interpretation and gives a new turn to the story. It brings out clearly, for instance, that Hengest was leader of the Eotens (the Jutes), which gives a definite meaning to a number of points usually left in a cloud. Would that Mr. Girvan had given us his own translation of the whole episode. In lieu of it I rashly venture to give what I make of ll. 1138-1150 after reading his lecture. 'He thought on revenge rather than on the sea-path, if he, the warrior of the Eotens, could bring to an end the angry feud on which he brooded in his mind. So he (Finn) turned not aside from the way of men when Hunlafing (Hengest) put the best of swords, battle-gleam, on his breast; on that account swords were known among the Eotens. So also Finn beheld again the bold warriors, cruel sword-bale at his own home, when Guthlaf and Óslaf after the sea-journey mourned in sorrow his cruel blow, taunted his share of their woes'.

On Mr. Girvan's arguments there is little likelihood of ever reconciling the *Episode* and the *Fragment*. It has been suggested that they both hark back to some cycle of lays about Finn; but Mr. Girvan thinks no such cycle ever existed. Is there then no relationship at all between the two? Perhaps, he thinks, the author of the *Fragment* had read or heard of the episode and had its numerous incidents telescoped in his mind as he made his Lay, a composition different in temper and different in language from *Beowulf*. It may seem curious to add that his interpretation of the Episode tallies better with the *Fragment* than any other I have consulted.



The volume closes with biographies of the eleven Fellows who died in 1939-1940. The account of the late R. B. McKerrow and the comprehensive estimate of his work, by Dr. W. W. Greg (pp. 489-515) will be read with deep interest by readers of *The Review of English Studies*.

W. D. TAYLOR.

**Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, Vol. XXVI.**

Collected by ARUNDELL ESDAILE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1941 (for 1940). Pp. 112. 7s. 6d. net.

'The Real Thomas Amory' by Mrs. Katharine A. Esdaile is the longest and the outstanding contribution to the present volume. Mrs. Esdaile disentangles the man from the somewhat inconsequent records that others have left of him and from the medley of autobiography and fiction which his writings present, above all *John Buncl*, and comes to the satisfactory conclusion that Buncl is Amory. The essential Amory, then, in his long life (1691-1788) was a fine lover of landscape, learned ladies, and miscellaneous antiquities including much theology.

He claimed to have been in Swift's company in his youth, and he was in contact with Priestley's circle in old age. He anticipated Johnson in his northern travels and Gray and Walpole in several of their most characteristic predilections. As a writer he was, too, a forerunner of Peacock, though lacking his wit and economy of style.

With her learning and insight Mrs. Esdaile may succeed, if Hazlitt and Lamb have failed, in inciting us to read *John Buncl*.

Tennyson, Mr. W. R. Rutland justly remarks, was a true child of the nineteenth century. As such he took from the scientific ferment of the times exactly what stimulated and expanded his innate prejudices. These were predominantly a conviction of immortality and an optimistic view of man's progress towards indefinitely higher types of being. In his learned and sympathetic paper Mr. Rutland surveys Tennyson's life-long interest in evolutionary theory. Nevertheless it seems too much to claim with A. C. Bradley that Tennyson's attitude to science was what a great modern poet's should be. To put it baldly, Tennyson was not scientifically minded at all. He made consummate use both of new ideas and of field observation for the imagery of his poems. Can it be claimed that he really grappled with the problems which the theories had called up? A poet to be a great poet of science must surely do that.

Miss D. M. Stuart in her 'Landscape in Augustan Verse' is all for the Romantic Revival and all against the Augustans. This is not a good start, and she does not mend matters for herself by saying that the Augustans treated landscape as a backcloth to human interest comparable to the vague bosky (delicious epithet of prejudice) vistas of Reynolds and Gainsborough portraits. Reynolds very likely—Gainsborough decidedly no, for the backgrounds of his rural conversation pieces present delightful passages of landscape directly and appropriately felt.

All poetic conventions have their weaknesses, and it is all too easy to make an *hortus siccus* of specimens culled partly from the better writers or more simply from those who would have been bad in any style. The late Mr. Pope and his friends, too, knew as well as, and better than, Miss Stuart to what extent vines curl and milk-white bulls spurn the rising sand in Berkshire. He and others were awedly writing to a convention which their readers understood. If man occupied the foreground, it did not prevent the poets from appreciating his

surroundings with fresh though generalized observation. Miss Stuart must forgive us if we refer her readers to Mr. Tillotson's discerning valuation of the Augustan idiom in the previous volume of this series.<sup>1</sup>

In the fifteenth century our language was in a period of transition gradually passing from Middle English to a form which Professor H. C. Wyld suggests should be recognized as Early Modern. The reader of to-day will find words and turns of phrase of startling modernity side by side with others long obsolete. In an essay compact with entertaining learning Professor Wyld provides a survey of 'Aspects of Style and Idiom in Fifteenth-Century English' which will inform the scholar and delight the general reader who relishes the enduring idiosyncrasy of English.

A Donne manuscript in Harvard College Library is unique among seventeenth-century collections in containing three sermons as well as the 'Divine Poems' and others. Mrs. Evelyn Simpson, an authority on Donne's prose works, by showing first that this manuscript is valuable for the text of the sermons, goes on to argue that its readings for the 'Divine Poems' deserve careful consideration. This is a valuable paper for students of Donne's text.

In 'Some Poetical Miscellanies 1672-1716' Mr. Hugh Macdonald first traces the decline of anthologizing from the days of the famous Elizabethan collections. Poetical miscellanies of the seventeenth century tended to be confined to verse written for particular occasions. It was not until 1672 apparently that the practice of collecting verse for its general interest or merit was revived with Hobart Kemp's 'A Collection of Poems Written Upon Several Occasions By Several Persons'. Mr. Macdonald very agreeably traces the bibliography of this collection which went through successive modified editions and stood up to its rivals until 1716, by which time a new taste in poetry was forming.

D. M. Low.

## SHORT NOTICES

**Anticipation.** By RICHARD TICKELL. Reprinted from the First Edition, 1778, with an Introduction, Notes and a Bibliography of Tickell's Writings, by L. H. Butterfield. New York: King's Crown Press. 1942. Pp. xiv+97. \$1.50.

Richard Tickell, author of the satirical poem *The Wreath of Fashion*, produced anonymously in 1778 this pamphlet, which purported to give an account of the forthcoming debates on the American War in the House of Commons. Commissioned by Lord North, it provides an excellent illustration of his political methods. The satire is mild, the chief critic of the government, Fox, is given the credit of a serious and well-written speech, and the general effect seems to have been to assist a relaxation of political tension such as North desired. As a specimen of Tickell's quality we may quote a passage from the speech attributed to Townsend, 'It is with the highest astonishment that I now see Gentlemen shifting their places, as if already tired of public business, or afraid to look into the deplorable and calamitous situation of this country: nay, so great is their inattention to their duty in P[a]rli[a]m[e]nt, that, upon my rising, I find the house almost cleared—where are the Members?—I am afraid—at dinner! Is this a time for revelling in taverns, when the dignity of the Imperial Crown of this country is violated, and much harm done to our merchants? . . . He then entered into a copious detail of the blunders of Administration, with respect to Falkland's Islands, the Middlesex Election, Corsica, and the massacre in St. George's Fields, Gibraltar, and Mr. Horne's imprisonment; together with cursory observations on the illegality of impressing, the bad policy of Lotteries, the fatal example of the Justitia, and the tremendous perils to this devoted country from the frequent exhibition of the Beggar's Opera'.

<sup>1</sup> Reviewed in *R.E.S.*, Vol. XVII, 1941 (No. 67, July).

The editing of the pamphlet is a model of thoroughness and judgment. Good humour is, unfortunately, not the quality most calculated to make a satire live. Perhaps the most comic remark occurs in the Foreword by Mr. Randolph G. Adams, who speaks of 'the ponderous serio-comic addresses delivered in what is still pleased to call itself the M-th-r of P-rl-m-nts'. As a description of House of Commons oratory in the days of Chatham, Fox, Burke, Sheridan and the Younger Pitt, this is a little less than adequate. We may be grateful to the editor that, unlike the author of the Foreword, he has refrained from drawing parallels between 'the bumbling follies of that legislative conclave, then and now'.

A. COBBAN.

**The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth.** Edited from the Journals by HYMAN EIGERMAN. 1940. New York: Columbia University Press; 1941, London: H. Milford. Pp. 106. \$2.00; 13s. 6d. net.

In his Foreword to this volume Professor Hoxie Neale Fairchild says that he has 'for years' been telling his students that Dorothy Wordsworth 'deserves to be regarded as a poet in her own right.' We agree that most of her readers must have recognized her imaginative insight and felicity of phrase and have noted for themselves how often these are combined in her Journals with beauty of cadence. 'Immediate sensuous experience observed with breathless intentness and set down in words of simple accuracy which move to a purely organic rhythm'—Professor Fairchild's is no new discovery of these in Dorothy's writings. Mr. Hyman Eigerman, however, goes considerably further when he lifts 'out of the context those passages' which seem to him 'to rise into poetry, preserving the words and the word order of the original, only marshalling them within the free-verse form which was unknown to their author'.

Each individual must judge for himself whether such a treatment of a text is justifiable even when it does not entail, as is admittedly the case in fourteen of the eighty-four 'poems' in this volume, the omission of words or passages felt by the compiler to be irrelevant or prosaic.

No one will deny the beauty of most of the selected passages; many will perhaps agree that a brief anthology of such extracts is of value. Whether it serves any useful purpose to introduce 'new line divisions' and 'free-verse form . . . unknown to their author' is a much more debatable question and one which the present reviewer answers unhesitatingly in the negative. Here are specimens by which her opinion can be tested:

- (3) Young lambs  
In a green pasture in the Coombe—  
Thick legs,  
Large heads,  
Black staring eyes.
- (25) The lake was covered all over  
With bright silver waves  
That were each  
The twinkling of an eye.
- (9) One only leaf  
Upon the top of a tree—  
The sole remaining leaf—  
Danced round and round  
Like a rag  
Blown by the wind.

She herself cannot feel that the words gain anything by their new typographical arrangement.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER AND G. D. WILLCOCK

E.L.H., Vol. 10, No. 2, June 1943—

Milton as a revolutionary (Merritt Y. Hughes), pp. 87-116.

The early development of the section on Ireland in Camden's *Britannia* (Rudolf B. Gottfried), pp. 117-30.

Charles Johnson and eighteenth century drama (M. Maurice Shudofsky), pp. 131-58.

Musical settings of Prior's lyrics in the eighteenth century (Majl Ewing), pp. 159-71.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. 6, No. 3, May 1943—

An unprinted poem by Charles Lamb (George L. Barnett), pp. 357-8.

From Huntington MS. 12286.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. 58, No. 5, May 1943—

Fra Celestino's affidavit and the *Ring and the Book* (Paul E. Beichner), pp. 335-40.

A Gawain epigone (Rossell Hope Robbins), pp. 361-6.

A poem from Capesthorpe MS. by Humfrey Newton (1466-1536).

More text-notes on *Deor* (L. Whitbread), pp. 367-9.

The orthodoxy of *Pearl* 603-4 (Marie P. Hamilton), pp. 370-2.

*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* 1954 (Helge Kökeritz), pp. 373-4.

On 'bordes'.

An Elizabethan Chaucer Glossary (Robert A. Caldwell), pp. 374-5.

John Holand's corrections and additions to Speght's Glossary (Camb. Univ. Lib. MS. Gg. 4.27).

Elizabethan lyrics from Tasso (Joan Murphy), pp. 375-7.

Falstaff's 'tardy tricks' (Henry J. Webb), pp. 377-9.

Greene's 'Tomliuclin': *Tamburlaine* or *Tom a Lincoln*? (W. F. McNeir), pp. 380-2.

Discussion as to which play is intended by 'Tomliuclin' in Greene's *Farewell to Folly*.

A possible source for the *Irish Knight* (W. F. McNeir), pp. 383-5.

A suggestion that the source of the lost play was Malory's story of Launceor, 'the Irysshe Knight'.

Felltham's *Character of the Low Countries* (Jean Robertson), pp. 385-8.

The poems of Owen Felltham (Jean Robertson), pp. 388-90.

Text of Felltham's Elegy on Mrs M. Coventry from Ashmole MS. 37. Art. 17.

Wordsworth in America: addenda (Lewis Leary), pp. 391-3.

Another Griswold forgery in a Poe letter (John Ward Ostrom), pp. 394-6.

Some words in Sir Thomas Elyot's *Of the Knowledge which maketh a wise Man* (Edwin J. Howard), pp. 396-7.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, No. 6, June 1943—

The principal source for Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (Thomas C. Izard), pp. 411-7.

Argument for Whetstone's *English Myrror*, 1586.

The play of Theano (Edwin W. Robbins), pp. 417-22.

A lost academic play: an attempt to identify its plot.

A note on the *Tempest*: a sequel (Thomas P. Harrison, Sr.), pp. 422-6.

On 'pioned' and 'twilled' (IV. i. 64).

'Men may grope's in such a scarre' (Tucker Brooke), pp. 426-8.

*All's Well*, IV. ii. 38-9.

A principal source of the *Battle of Alcazar* (Warner G. Rice), pp. 428-31.

On Polemon's translation of Freigius' *Historia de Bello Africano*, 1587.

Notes on Nicoll's Handlist for 1800-1850 (Majl Ewing), pp. 460-4.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 184, June 19, 1943—

Minor spirits and superstitions in the Waverley Novels (Coleman O. Parsons), pp. 358-63.

Continued Vol. 185, July 3, pp. 4-9.

Anglo-Saxon tribal offshoots (F. Williamson), pp. 363-5.

Notes on a Key . . . to . . . *Absalom and Achitophel* (James G. McManaway), pp. 365-6.

Vol. 185, July 3, 1943—

William Wycherley's *Posthumous Works* (Howard P. Vincent), pp. 12-13.

July 17—

The Johnson-Boswell correspondence (R. W. Chapman), pp. 32-9.

Evidence that Poe knew Greek (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 39-40.

Shakespeare and Florio (Frederick Page), pp. 42-4.

Continued from *N. & Q.*, Vol. 184, May 8, pp. 283-5.

July 31—

Diamond-satires in the eighteenth century (Mary Claire Randolph), pp. 62-5.

The habit of inscribing satires on windows.

Milton and Archbishop Ussher (Ralph A. Haug), pp. 66-7.

Thomas Nashe: notices of Rome in the *Unfortunate Traveller* (E. S. de Beer), pp. 67-70.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. 57,

No. 1, March 1942—

Grendel and Grep (Kemp Malone), pp. 1-14.

Robert Mannyng of Brunne: a new biography (Ruth Crosby), pp. 15-28.

Author's revision in the *Canterbury Tales* (Carleton Brown), pp. 29-50.

'Homicide' in the *Parson's Tale* (Dudley R. Johnson), pp. 51-6.

Its source in Pennaforte's *Summa Casuum Conscientiae*.

Sources of Rastell's *Four Elements* (Elizabeth M. Nugent), pp. 74-88.

Thomas Percy: antiquarian vs. man of taste (Leah Dennis), pp. 140-54.

The sources, significance and date of Franklin's *An Arabian Tale* (Arthur Stuart Pitt), pp. 155-68.

Lord Byron as Rinaldo (David V. Erdman), pp. 189-231.

Browning's reputation at Oxford, 1855-1859 (M. B. Cramer), pp. 232-40.

Hawthorne's literary theory (Charles Howell Foster), pp. 241-54.

Matthew Arnold and science (Fred A. Dudley), pp. 275-94.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, No. 2,  
June—

The Judgment of Paris in the *Seege of Troye* (E. Bagby Atwood), pp. 343-53.  
Oxford and *Endimion* (Josephine Waters Bennett), pp. 354-69.

Milton's ideal day (Sara Ruth Watson), pp. 404-20.

Pluche and Derham, new sources of Goldsmith (Winifred Lynskey), pp. 435-45.

Edmund Burke and the book reviews in Dodsley's *Annual Register* (Thomas Wellsted Copeland), pp. 446-68.

Shelley vs. Southey: new light on an old quarrel (K. N. Cameron), pp. 489-512.

Sources for Poe's *Arthur Gordon Pym*, 'Hans Pfaal' and other pieces (J. O. Bailey), pp. 513-35.

A note on 'Dux Vitae' and 'Lifes Lattiw' (Cecilia A. Hotchner), pp. 572-5.  
Possible influence of O.E. expression on the Latin.

Shakespearean cuts in Restoration Dublin (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 575-6.

The first English translation of Wieland's *Oberon* (William A. Collwell), pp. 576-82.

Text of sixteen stanzas from Canto 9, translated by James Six, in *Deutsches Museum*, 1784.

Not by Elizabeth Barrett Browning (Aurelia Brooks Harlan), pp. 582-5.  
On 'To Robert Lytton.'

Hallam's suppressed allusion to Tennyson (T. H. Vail Motter), pp. 587-9.

Thackeray and N. P. Willis (Harold H. Scudder), pp. 589-92.

## — No. 3, September—

The Auchinleck manuscript and a possible London bookshop of 1330-1340 (Laura Hibbard Loomis), pp. 595-627.

Five new Gretham sermons and the Middle English *Mirru* (Charlton Laird), pp. 628-37.

On Huntington MS. 903.

Analysis of imagery: a critique of literary method (Lillian Herlands Hornstein), pp. 638-53.

The *Merry Wives* Quarto, a farce interlude (Vincent H. Ogburn), pp. 654-60.

Stylistic devices in Chapman's *Iliads* (Phyllis Brooks Bartlett), pp. 661-75.

Donne and the couplet (Arnold Stein), pp. 676-96.

The function of the prologues in *Paradise Lost* (John S. Diekhoff), pp. 697-704.

The theory of the mixed state and the development of Milton's political thought (Z. S. Fink), pp. 705-36.

Samuel Butler's rise to fame (Lee Elbert Holt), pp. 867-78.

## — No. 4, December—

Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book (Dorothy Bethurum), pp. 916-29.

The four daughters of God in the *Gesta Romanorum* and the *Court of Sapience* (Sister Mary Immaculate), pp. 951-65.

Some continuing traditions in English devotional literature (Helen C. White), pp. 966-80.

Spenserian armor (Allan H. Gilbert), pp. 981-7.

How great was Shakespeare's debt to Montaigne? (Alice Harmon), pp. 988-1008.



The evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew* (Raymond A. Houk), pp. 1009-38.  
The dynamic image in metaphysical poetry (Alice S. Brandenburg), pp.

1039-45.

Smollett's pamphleteering foe Shebbeare (James R. Foster), pp. 1053-1100.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. 40, No. 2, April 1943—

Bruno, Sidney and Spenser (Angelo M. Pellegrini), pp. 128-44.

The Roman background of *Titus Andronicus* (Robert Adger Law), pp. 145-53.

New light on Ben Jonson's workmanship (Ernest William Talbert), pp. 154-85.

John Cotgrave's *English Treasury of Wit and Language* and the Elizabethan drama (Gerald Eades Bentley), pp. 186-203.

A critical survey of scholarship in the field of English literature of the renaissance (Rosemond Tuve), pp. 204-55.

Recent literature of the renaissance: a bibliography (ed. Hardin Craig), pp. 256-353.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, June 12, 1943—

'That two-handed engine' (Kathleen Crighton Tomlinson), p. 283.

Another letter from W. R. Dunston, *ibid.*; reply from Katharine A. Esdaile, June 19, p. 295; from H. Beckett, July 3, p. 319.

A poem of A. E. Housman's (John Carter), p. 288.

Continued from *T.L.S.*, June 5, p. 276.

June 26—

MS. adventures of *Tess* (Richard L. Purdy), p. 307.

See *T.L.S.*, March 6, p. 120.

The Cowden Clarkes (Richard D. Altick), p. 307.

Request for letters and information.

July 10—

A poem of Swift's (E. St. John Brooks), p. 331.

A variant version 'On the Little House by the Church Yard of Castleknock' from Brett's *Miscellany*, Dublin, 1752.

New lines from Blake's *Jerusalem* (Geoffrey Keynes), p. 336.

Lines from an early proof of the frontispiece plate.

July 17—

Pierce Egan the elder (George L. Marsh), p. 348.

Notice of a unique copy, in the Huntington Library, of a hitherto unknown book, *Epsom Races*, and a request for further information about Egan's works. Reply from Hubert J. Norman, August 7, p. 384.

July 24—

New Smollett letters (Henry W. Meikle), p. 360.

Letters recently presented to the National Library of Scotland. Concluded July 31, p. 372.

July 31—

*Horae Subsecivae* (Douglas Bush), p. 367.

On its authorship.

August 7—

Swift and Dr. Wilson (E. St. John Brooks), p. 379.

Byron's 'Lines to E. N. Long' (M. L. Poston), p. 384.

A variant autograph MS. version.

## INDEX

- Abbott, C. Colleer, review by, 311
- Alleman, G. S., his *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy* reviewed, 424
- Allison, A. F., article on *The Poetry of A. E. Housman*, 276
- America, *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*, by James D. Hart, reviewed, 105; *Anglo-American Literary Relations*, by G. S. Gordon, reviewed, 318
- Anticipation*, by R. Tickell, edited by L. H. Butterfield, noticed, 444
- Areopagitica* (1644), note on the word 'muing' in, by G. Udny Yule, 61
- Art of Courtly Love, The*, a translation by J. J. Parry, reviewed, 77
- '*Atheist's Tragedy*', *Tourneur's, The Influence of Calvinistic Thought in*, article by M. H. Higgins, 255
- Auden, W. H., his contribution to *The Intent of the Critic* reviewed, 317
- Bald, R. C., note on Leicester's Men in the Low Countries, 395
- Balderston, Katherine C., her edition of *Thraliana* reviewed, 93
- Barclay, Alexander, note by W. Nelson, 59
- Batho, Edith C., reviews by, 103, 436, 437
- Battenhouse, R. W., his *Marlowe's Tamburlaine. A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy* reviewed, 304
- Beaumont, F., *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger*, by B. Maxwell, reviewed, 80
- Bennett, H. S., article on *Caxton and his Public*, 113
- Bennett, Joan, review by, 325
- '*Beowulf*', *The Rhythm of*, by J. C. Pope, reviewed, 73
- Bible, *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible*, by C. C. Butterworth, reviewed, 215
- Blunden, E., review by, 437
- Boas, F. S., reviews by, 80, 306, 413
- Boys, R. C., his edition of *Grongar Hill*, by J. Dyer, reviewed, 90
- Bride of Lammermoor, The*, see Scott
- Bridges, Robert. *A Study of Traditionalism in Poetry*, by A. Guérard, Jr., reviewed, 309
- British Academy, *Proceedings of the*, 1940, reviewed, 440
- Bronte, Emily Jane, *The Complete Poems of*, edited by C. W. Hatfield, reviewed, 437
- Brooke, R., *Variants in the Manuscripts of the Poems of Rupert Brooke and A. E. Housman*, article by M. Platnauer, 386
- Brooks, C., his contribution to *The Language of Poetry* reviewed, 438
- Brooks, H. F., review by, 424
- Butler, H. E., review by, 313
- Butt, J., reviews by, 93, 315
- Butterfield, L. H., his edition of *Anticipation*, by R. Tickell, noticed, 444
- Butterworth, C. C., *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible* reviewed, 215
- Calvin, J., *The Influence of Calvinistic Thought in Tourneur's 'Atheist's Tragedy'*, article by M. H. Higgins, 255
- Carlyle and the Saint-Simonians: *The Concept of Historical Periodicity*, by Hill Shine, noticed, 224
- Cawley, R. R., his introduction to a facsimile edition of *The Truth of Our Times* (1638), by H. Peacham, reviewed, 419
- Caxton, W., *Caxton and his Public*, article by H. S. Bennett, 113
- Chambers, Sir Edmund K., *A Sheaf of Studies* reviewed, 104
- Chapman, R. W., note on Scott's *Antiquary*, 295; note on Johnson's *Literary Earnings*, 403
- Clinton-Baddeley, V. C., his *Words for Music* reviewed, 315
- Cobban, A., notices by, 224, 444
- Coffin, C. M., his facsimile reprint of *Ignatius his Conclave*, by J. Donne, reviewed, 83
- Criticism, *The Intent of the Critic*, by E. Wilson, N. Foerster, J. C. Ransom, and W. H. Auden, reviewed, 317

Darbishire, Helen, review by, 97; notice by, 330  
 Daube, D., 'Three Notes on *Paradise Regained*', 205  
 Davis, B. E. C., reviews by, 317, 324, 438  
 Defoe, D., *Swift and Defoe. A Study in Relationship*, by J. F. Ross, reviewed, 89  
 Dennis, J., note on a satire on, 1711, by Mary Dias, 213  
 Dias, Mary, note on A Satire on John Dennis, 1711, 213  
 Diction, Poetic, in the English Renaissance, by V. L. Rubel, reviewed, 216  
 Dignity of Kingship Asserted, *The*, by G. S., a facsimile edition, reviewed, 217  
 Disraeli, B., note by C. L. Cline on Disraeli and Thackeray, 404  
 Dodds, J. W., his *Thackeray: A Critical Portrait* reviewed, 222  
 Donne, J., note on his 'Extasie', by E. M. W. Tillyard, 67; *From Donne to Dryden: The Revolt against Metaphysical Poetry*, by R. L. Sharp, reviewed, 84; *Ignatius his Conclave*, facsimile ed. with an introduction by C. M. Coffin, reviewed, 83  
 Drama, Marlowe's *Faustus: A Reconsideration*, article by L. Kirschbaum, 225; *Some Notes on the Players in Oxford, 1661-1713*, article by Sybil Rosenfeld, 366; *The Growth of Shakespeare's Vocabulary*, article by A. Hart, 242; *The Influence of Calvinistic Thought in Tourneur's 'Atheist's Tragedy'*, article by M. H. Higgins, 255; *'The Taming of A Shrew' and 'The Taming of The Shrew'*, article by G. I. Duthie, 337; Leicester's Men in the Low Countries, note by R. C. Bald, 395; Sebastian Westcott, Master of the Children of St. Paul's, note by C. J. Sisson, 204; Suckling's imitation of Shakespeare, note by Ruth Wallerstein, 290; *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy*, by G. S. Alleman, reviewed, 924; *Pathomachia*, edited by P. E. Smith, reviewed, 306; *A Book of Short Plays XV-XX Centuries*, noticed, 330  
 Dryden, J., *Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques*, article by Ruth Wallerstein, 165; *From Donne to Dryden: The Revolt against Metaphysical Poetry*, by R. L. Sharp, reviewed, 84; *The Letters of John Dryden*, edited by C. E. Ward, reviewed, 308  
 Duthie, G. I., article on 'The Taming of

*A Shrew' and 'The Taming of The Shrew'*, 337; reviews by, 79, 416  
 Dyer, J., his *Grongar Hill*, edited by R. C. Boys, reviewed, 90  
 Edib, Halide, her *Ingiliz Edebiyati Tarihi* reviewed, 107  
 Eigerman, H., *The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth* noticed, 445  
 Eighteenth-century, an anonymous poem entitled 'The Actor's Epitome', 70; *A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715)*, by W. T. Morgan and Chloe S. Morgan, reviewed, 427; *Guinea's Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century*, by W. Sypher, reviewed, 431; *Three Tours through London in the years 1748, 1776, 1797*, by Wilmarth S. Lewis, reviewed, 96  
 Ellis-Fermor, Una, notice by, 330  
 English Institute Annual (Columbia University), 1941, reviewed, 320  
 Esdaile, A., his collection *Essays and Studies* by Members of the English Association, Vol. XXVI, reviewed, 443  
 Essays and Studies, Vol. XXVI, reviewed, 443; Vol. XXVII, reviewed, 328  
 Essays by *Divers Hands*, Vol. XIX, reviewed 328  
 Evans, Willa McC., her *Henry Lawes, Musician and Friend of Poets* reviewed, 86  
 Fiction, *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose*, by P. B. Gove, reviewed, 430  
 Fletcher, J., *Characterization in John Fletcher's Tragicomedies*, article by E. M. Waith, 141; *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger*, by B. Maxwell, reviewed, 80  
 Foerster, N., his contribution to *The Intent of the Critic* reviewed, 317; his contribution to *Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods* reviewed, 326  
 Freeman, Rosemary, reviews by, 83, 419  
 Garrick, D., *Notes on some Manuscripts relating to David Garrick*, article by L. L. Martz and E. M. Martz, 186  
 Gascoigne, George, *Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet*, by C. T. Prouty, reviewed, 302  
 George, M. D., reviews by, 96, 220  
 Girvan, Ritchie, review by, 73  
 Gordon, D. J., reviews by, 105, 318; notice by, 108

- Gordon, G. S., his *Anglo-American Literary Relations* reviewed, 318
- Gordon, R. K., notice by, 108
- Gove, P. B., *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction*, reviewed, 430
- Greg, W. W., *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*, reviewed, 410; review by, 320
- Grongar Hill, by J. Dyer, edited by R. C. Boys, reviewed, 90
- Guérard, A., Jr., his *Robert Bridges. A Study of Traditionalism* reviewed, 309
- Guinea's *Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century*, by W. Sypher, reviewed, 431
- Gwynn, A., article on *The Date of the B-Text of 'Piers Plowman'*, 1
- Habib, Ismael, his *Avrupa Edebiyatı ve Biz* reviewed, 107
- Hallam, Arthur, *The Writings of*, edited by T. H. V. Motter, reviewed, 437
- Hamlet, The Character of, and Other Essays*, by J. E. Hankins, reviewed, 79
- Hankins, J. E., *The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays* reviewed, 79
- Harding, Rosamund E. M., *An Anatomy of Inspiration* reviewed, 324
- Hart, A., article on *Vocabularies of Shakespeare's Plays*, 128; article on *The Growth of Shakespeare's Vocabulary*, 242; his *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies. A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos* reviewed, 416
- Hart, James D., *The Oxford Companion to American Literature* reviewed, 105
- Hatfield, C. W., his edition of *The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Bronte* reviewed, 437
- Havens, Raymond D., *The Mind of a Poet. Study of Wordsworth's Thought with particular reference to 'The Prelude'* reviewed, 97
- Hawthorne, N., *The English Notebooks*, edited by Randall Stewart, reviewed, 103
- Herbert, G., note on his poem 'The Quidditie', by F. P. Wilson, 398
- Higgins, M. H., article on *The Influence of Calvinistic Thought in Tournet's 'Atheist's Tragedy'*, 255
- History, A Bibliography of British (1700-1715)*, by W. T. Morgan and Chloe S. Morgan, reviewed, 427
- Hoare, Dorothy M., review by, 309
- Homophones, Two Sets of Shakespearean*, article by H. Kökeritz, 357
- Hopkins, Gerard Manley: *Priest and Poet*, by J. Pick, reviewed, 311
- Housman, A. E., *The Poetry of A. E. Housman*, article by A. F. Allison, 276; *Variants in the Manuscripts of the Poems of Rupert Brooke and A. E. Housman*, article by M. Platnauer, 386
- Hungerford, E. B., his *Shores of Darkness* reviewed, 439
- Hutchinson, F. E., review by, 215
- Ignatius his *Conclave or His Inthronisation in a Late Election in Hell*, by J. Donne, a facsimile with an introduction by C. M. Coffin, reviewed, 83
- Inspiration, An Anatomy of*, by Rosamund E. M. Harding, reviewed, 324
- Izard, T. C., his *George Whetstone, Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters* reviewed, 413
- Johnson, S., *Samuel Johnson's Poems*, article by D. Nichol Smith, 44; Johnson's *Literary Earnings: A Problem*, note by R. W. Chapman, 403
- Kirschbaum, L., article on *Marlowe's Faustus: A Reconsideration*, 225
- Knight, G. W., *The Starlit Dome. Studies in the Poetry of Vision*, reviewed, 323
- Kökeritz, H., article on *Two Sets of Shakespearean Homophones*, 357
- Langland, W., *The Date of the B-Text of 'Piers Plowman'*, article by A. Gwynn, 1
- Latin, Poems in*, compiled by J. Sparrow, reviewed, 313
- Lawes, Henry, *Musician and Friend of Poets*, by Willa McClung Evans, reviewed, 86
- Leicester's Men in the Low Countries, note by R. C. Bald, 395
- Lewis, C. S., review by, 77
- Lewis, W. S., his *Three Tours through London in the years 1748, 1776, 1797*, reviewed, 96
- Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods*, by N. Foerster, J. C. McCalliard, R. Wellek, A. Warren, and W. L. Schramm, reviewed, 326
- Literature, The Nature of Literature. Its Relation to Science, Language and Human Experience*, by T. C. Pollock, reviewed, 325
- Lombardelli, Orazio, and Henry Wotton, note by R. Weiss, 285
- London, Three Tours through London in the*

- years 1748, 1776, 1797, by Wilmarth S. Lewis, reviewed, 96
- Low, D. M., review by, 443
- Maas, P., note on 'Hid in', *Lycidas*, l. 69, 397; review by, 410
- Mabbott, T. O., his introduction to *Edgar Allan Poe: The Raven and Other Poems* noticed, 108
- Macbeth, article on *Source and Motive in 'Macbeth' and 'Othello'*, by E. E. Stoll, 25
- Macdonald, H., article on *Another Aspect of Seventeenth-Century Prose*, 33; reviews by, 308, 421
- McGalliard, J. C., his contribution to *Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods* reviewed, 326
- McKillop, A. D., *The Background of Thomson's 'Seasons'* reviewed, 218
- Malone, K., note on Plurilinear Units in Old English Poetry, 201
- Marlowe, C., *Marlowe's Faustus: A Reconsideration*, article by L. Kirschbaum, 225; *Marlowe's Tamburlaine. A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy*, by R. W. Battenhouse, reviewed, 304
- Martz, L. L., article on *Notes on some Manuscripts relating to David Garrick*, 186; *The Later Career of Thomas Smollett*, reviewed, 433
- Martz, Edwin M., article on *Notes on some Manuscripts relating to David Garrick*, 186
- Massinger, P., *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger*, by B. Maxwell, reviewed, 80
- Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy, by G. S. Alleman, reviewed, 424
- Maxwell, B., his *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* reviewed, 80
- Milton, J., Three Notes on *Paradise Regained*, by D. Daube, 205; the word 'muing' in Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644), note and letter by G. Udny Yule, 61, 409; 'Hid in', *Lycidas*, l. 69, note by P. Maas, 397; *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted: In answer to Mr. Milton's 'Ready and Easie Way to establish a Free Common-Wealth'*, by G. S., a *Lover of Loyalty*, a facsimile edition with an introduction by W. R. Parker, reviewed, 217; *Milton in the Puritan Revolution*, by D. M. Wolfe, reviewed, 85; *Vondel and Milton*, by Jehangir R. P. Mody, noticed, 330
- Morgan, Chloe S., *A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715)*, reviewed, 427
- Morgan, W. T., *A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715)*, reviewed, 427
- Morley, Edith J., review by, 100; notice by, 445
- Morrell, W. P., review by, 88
- Music, *Henry Lawes, Musician and Friend of Poets*, by Willa McC. Evans, reviewed, 86; *Words for Music*, by V. C. Clinton-Baddeley, reviewed, 315
- Needler, G. H., *The Lone Shieling* noticed, 108
- Nelson, W., note on Alexander Barclay, 59
- Old English Poetry, Plurilinear Units in, note by Kemp Malone, 201
- Othello*, article on *Source and Motive in 'Macbeth' and 'Othello'*, by E. E. Stoll, 25
- Otway, Thomas, his *Don Carlos*, 167
- Paradise Regained*, three notes on, by D. Daube, 205
- Parker, W. R., his ed. of *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted*, by G. S., reviewed, 217
- Parry, J. J., his translation of *De Arte Honeste Amandi*, by Andreas Capellanus, reviewed, 77
- Parsons, Coleman O., article on *The Dalrymple Legend in 'The Bride of Lammermoor'*, 51
- Pathomachia*, an edition by P. E. Smith reviewed, 306
- Peacham, H., facs. edition of *The Truth of Our Times* (1638), with an introduction by R. R. Cawley, reviewed, 419
- Penrose, B., his *Urbane Travellers* (1591-1635) reviewed, 418
- Periodical Literature, Summary of, by Alice Walker and Gladys D. Willcock, 109, 331, 446
- Pick, J., his *Gerard Manley Hopkins: Priest and Poet* reviewed, 311
- 'Piers Plowman', *The Date of the B-Text of*, article by A. Gwynn, 1
- Pinto, V. de S., reviews by, 104, 328
- Piozzi, see Thrale
- Place-Names of Essex, *The*, by P. H. Reaney, letter from G. V. Smithers, 409
- Platnauer, M., article on *Variants in the Manuscripts of the Poems of Rupert Brooke and A. E. Housman*, 386
- Plurilinear Units in Old English Poetry, note by Kemp Malone, 201

- Poe, Edgar Allan: *The Raven and Other Poems*, a facsimile edition with an introduction by T. O. Mabbott, noticed, 108
- Poetry, Samuel Johnson's *Poems*, article by D. Nichol Smith, 44; Thomas Warton's *Miscellany: 'The Union'*, article by D. Nichol Smith, 263; *Variants in the Manuscripts of the Poems of Rupert Brooke and A. E. Housman*, article by M. Platnauer, 386; *The Poetry of A. E. Housman*, article by A. F. Allison, 276; Plurilinear Units in Old English Poetry, note by Kemp Malone, 201; Donne's 'Extasie', note by E. M. W. Tillyard, 67; George Herbert's 'The Quidditie', note by F. P. Wilson, 398; 'Hid in', *Lycidas*, l. 69, note by P. Maas, 397; *Paradise Regained*, three notes by D. Daube, 205; an anonymous eighteenth-century poem entitled 'The Actor's Epitome', 70; *The Prelude VI*, 160-74 (1805), 142-54 (1850), note by E. de Selincourt, 71; *The Rhythm of 'Beowulf'*. *An Interpretation of the Normal and Hypermetric Verse Forms in Old English Poetry*, by J. C. Pope, reviewed, 73; *From Donne to Dryden: The Revolt against Metaphysical Poetry*, by R. L. Sharp, reviewed, 84; *Poems in Latin*, compiled by J. Sparrow, reviewed, 313; *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance*, by V. L. Rubel, reviewed, 216; *The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth*, edited by H. Eigerman, noticed, 445; *The Starlit Dome. Studies in the Poetry of Vision*, by G. W. Knight, reviewed, 323; *The Language of Poetry*, by P. Wheelwright, C. Brooks, I. A. Richards, and W. Stevens, edited by A. Tate, reviewed, 438; *Shores of Darkness*, by E. B. Hungerford, reviewed, 439.
- Pollock, T. C., *The Nature of Literature. Its Relation to Science, Language and Human Experience* reviewed, 325
- Printing, Caxton and his Public, article by H. S. Bennett, 113
- Prose, *Another Aspect of Seventeenth-Century*, article by H. Macdonald, 33
- Prouty, C. T., his *George Gascoigne, Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet*, reviewed, 302
- Quinlan, M. J., *A Victorian Prelude. A History of English Manners 1700-1830* reviewed, 220
- Rajan, B., note on the motivation of Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, 297
- Ransom, J. C., his contribution to *The Intent of the Critic* reviewed, 317
- Raven, C. E., his *John Ray, Naturalist. His Life and Works*, reviewed, 421
- Ray, John, *Naturalist. His Life and Works*, by C. E. Raven, reviewed, 421
- Reaney, P. H., letter from G. V. Smithers about *The Place-Names of Essex*, 409
- Renaissance, Marlowe's *Tamburlaine. A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy*, by R. W. Battenhouse, reviewed, 304; *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance*, by V. L. Rubel, reviewed, 216
- Renwick, W. L., review by, 216
- Restoration Comedy, *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of*, by G. S. Alleman, reviewed, 424
- Richards, I. A., his contribution to *The Language of Poetry* reviewed, 438
- Ridley, M. R., review by, 439
- Rochester, Earl of, note on his marriage, by J. H. Wilson, 399
- Rosenfeld, S., article on *The Players in Oxford, 1661-1713*, 366
- Ross, J. F., his *Swift and Defoe. A Study in Relationship* reviewed, 89
- Rubel, V. L., his *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance* reviewed, 216
- Saint-Simonians, see Carlyle
- Satire, a, on John Dennis, 1711, note by Mary Dias, 213
- Schramm, W. L., his contribution to *Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods* reviewed, 326
- Scott, Sir Walter, *The Dalrymple Legend in 'The Bride of Lammermoor'*, article by Coleman O. Parsons, 51; note on his *Antiquary* by R. W. Chapman, 295
- Seasons, *The Background of Thomson's*, by A. D. McKillop, reviewed, 218
- Selincourt, E. de, note on *The Prelude VI*, 160-74 (1805), 142-54 (1850), 71; review by, 67; his edition *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth* reviewed, 100
- Seventeenth-Century Prose, *Another Aspect of*, article by H. Macdonald, 33
- Sewell, A., article on *Notes on the Integrity of 'Troilus and Cressida'*, 120
- S., G., a facsimile edition of his *Dignity of Kingship Asserted*, reviewed, 217
- Shakespeare, W., *Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques*, article by Ruth Wallerstein, 165; *The Growth of*



- Shakespeare's Vocabulary*, article by A. Hart, 242; *Notes on the Integrity of 'Troilus and Cressida'*, article by A. Sewall, 120; *Source and Motive in 'Macbeth' and 'Othello'*, article by E. E. Stoll, 25; *'The Taming of A Shrew' and 'The Taming of the Shrew'*, article by G. I. Duthie, 337; *Two Sets of Shakespearean Homophones*, article by H. Kökeritz, 357; *Vocabularies of Shakespeare's Plays*, article by A. Hart, 128; Suckling's imitation of Shakespeare, note by Ruth Wallerstein, 290; *The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays*, by J. E. Hankins, reviewed, 79; *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*, by W. W. Greg, reviewed, 410; *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies. A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos*, by A. Hart, reviewed, 416
- Sheaf of Studies, A*, by Sir Edmund K. Chambers, reviewed, 104
- Shelling, The Lone: Origin and Authorship of the Blackwood 'Canadian Boat-Song'*, by G. H. Needler, noticed, 108
- Shelley, P. B., note on the motivation of *Prometheus Unbound*, by B. Rajan, 297
- Shine, Hill, her *Carlyle and the Saint-Simonians: The Concept of Historical Periodicity* noticed, 224
- Shores of Darkness*, by E. B. Hungerford, reviewed, 439
- Sisson, C. J., note on Sebastian Westcott, 204
- Slavery, *Guinea's Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century*, by W. Sypher, reviewed, 431
- Smalley, Beryl, an appeal for information concerning an eighteenth-century poem entitled 'The Actor's Epitome', 70
- Smith, D. Nichol, article on *Samuel Johnson's Poems*, 44; article on *Thomas Warton's Miscellany: 'The Union'*, 263
- Smith, P. E., his edition of *Pathomachia* reviewed, 306
- Smithers, G. V., letter on *The Place-Names of Essex*, 409
- Smollett, T., *The Later Career of Thomas Smollett*, by L. L. Martz, reviewed, 433
- Sparrow, J., his collection *Poems in Latin* reviewed, 313
- Spens, J., review by, 302
- Starlit Dome, The, Studies in the Poetry of Vision*, by G. W. Knight, reviewed, 323
- Stevens, W., his contribution to *The Language of Poetry* reviewed, 438
- Stewart, R., his edition of *The English Notebooks*, by N. Hawthorne, reviewed, 103
- Stoll, E. E., article on *Source and Motive in 'Macbeth' and 'Othello'*, 25
- Suckling, Sir John, note by Ruth Wallerstein on his imitation of Shakespeare, 290
- Sutherland, James R., reviews by, 84, 218, 427
- Swift, J., *Swift and Defoe. A Study in Relationship*, by J. F. Ross, reviewed, 89
- Sypher, W., his *Guinea's Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century* reviewed, 431
- Tate, A., his edition *The Language of Poetry* reviewed, 438
- Taylor, E. G. R., reviews by, 418, 430
- Taylor, W. D., reviews by, 89, 431, 440
- Temple, Sir William. The Man and his Work*, by H. E. Woodbridge, reviewed, 88
- Thackeray, W. M., note by C. L. Cline on *Disraeli and Thackeray*, 404; *Thackeray: A Critical Portrait*, by J. W. Dodds, reviewed, 222
- Thomson, J., *The Background of Thomson's 'Seasons'*, by A. D. McKillop, reviewed, 218
- Thrale, Mrs. Hester Lynch, *Thraliana. The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*, edited by Katharine C. Balderston, reviewed, 93
- Tickell, R., his *Anticipation*, edited L. H. Butterfield, noticed, 444
- Tillotson, G., reviews by, 90, 326
- Tillotson, Kathleen, review by, 323
- Tillyard, E. M. W., note on J. Donne's 'Extasie', 67
- Tompkins, J. M. S., reviews by, 222, 433
- Tourneur, C., *The Influence of Calvinistic Thought in Tourneur's 'Atheist's Tragedy'*, article by M. H. Higgins, 255
- Tragicomedy, *Characterization in John Fletcher's Tragicomedies*, article by E. M. Waith, 141
- Travel, *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction*, by P. B. Gove, reviewed, 430; *Three Tours through London in the years 1748, 1776, 1797*, by W. S. Lewis, reviewed, 96; *Urbane Travellers, 1591-1635*, by B. Penrose, reviewed, 418
- Troilus and Cressida*, see *Shakespeare Truth of Our Times, The*, by H. Peacham,

- reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by R. R. Cawley, reviewed, 419
- Victorian Prelude, A History of English Manners, 1700-1830*, by M. J. Quinlan, reviewed, 220
- Vondel and Milton*, by Jehangir R. P. Mody, noticed, 330
- Waith, E. M., article on *Characterization in John Fletcher's Tragicomedies*, 141
- Walker, Alice, Summary of Periodical Literature, 109, 331, 446
- Wallerstein, Ruth, article on *Dryden and the Analysis of Shakespeare's Techniques*, 165; note on Suckling's imitation of Shakespeare, 290
- Ward, B. E., his edition of *The Letters of John Dryden* reviewed, 308
- Warren, A., his contribution to *Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods* reviewed, 326
- Warton, T., *Thomas Warton's Miscellany: 'The Union'*, article by D. Nichol Smith, 363
- Weiss, R., note on Henry Wotton and Orazio Lombardelli, 285
- Wellek, R., his contribution to *Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods* reviewed, 326
- Welsford, Enid, review by, 304
- Westcott, S., Master of the Children of St. Paul's, note by C. J. Sisson, 204
- Wheelwright, P., his contribution to *The Language of Poetry* reviewed, 438
- Whetstone, G., *George Whetstone. Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters*, by T. C. Izard, reviewed, 413
- Willcock, Gladys D., Summary of Periodical Literature 331, 446
- Wilson, E., his contribution to *The Intent of the Critic* reviewed, 317
- Wilson, F. P., note on George Herbert's 'The Quidditie', 398
- Wilson, J. H., note on the Earl of Rochester's Marriage, 399
- Wisely, J. T., review by, 86
- Wolfe, D. M., his *Milton in the Puritan Revolution* reviewed, 85
- Woodbridge, H. E., his *Sir William Temple. The Man and his Work* reviewed, 88
- Words for Music*, by V. C. Clinton-Baddeley, reviewed, 315
- Wordsworth, Dorothy, *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth*, edited by E. de Selincourt, reviewed, 100; *The Poetry of Dorothy Wordsworth*, edited by H. Eigerman, noticed, 445
- Wordsworth, W., note by E. de Selincourt on *The Prelude* VI, 160-74 (1805), 142-54 (1850), 71; *The Mind of a Poet. A Study of Wordsworth's Thought with particular reference to 'The Prelude'*, by Raymond D. Havens, reviewed, 97; *The One Wordsworth*, by Mary E. Burton, reviewed, 436
- Wotton, Sir Henry, and Orazio Lombardelli, note by R. Weiss, 285
- Wright, B. A., reviews by, 85, 217
- Yule, G. Udny, note and letter on the word 'muing' in Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644), 61, 409

